



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

No. 112

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.

July 25, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN CAMPBELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

A WEEK IN POLITICAL WONDERLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We begin another week in political wonderland. The Dow falls 100 points at the opening bell. What is it that we should do?

Well, if we had the knowledge and problem-solving skills of average college sophomore economic students, or women in a church study group, before the week is out, we would take some simple steps.

First, we would understand that, in a divided government with real economic challenges, no one group is allowed, especially those representing a minority opinion, to have their way entirely.

Then, we would begin by repealing the silly debt ceiling limitation, a law that was enacted in 1917 when the United States was about to embark upon a borrowing binge in World War I. It was used to look like we were fiscally responsible, a charade that we have done dozens of times since.

The fact is, these are debts we've already incurred, and the United States will honor them. What sort of theatrics are we going to go through until we finally own up?

Next, we would actually deal with the twin challenges of unsustainable spending and tax cuts along with the need to restore our economy and compete in a global business environment.

In an ideal world, my Republican friends would use their opportunity over the next 10 weeks to actually show how they would control spending in a way that is possible within the political process. In fact, they would have two opportunities between now and the election to actually shut down the government, if they didn't get their way, to highlight that effort.

We would also deal with a real consensus on things like military spending. There's broad agreement across party lines. For example, why shouldn't we, more than a half century after the end of World War II, 22 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, bring those troops home from Europe? Of course we can do that, and it's a start of many things that would help us restore balance to our military spending.

Next, we can deal meaningfully with our health care costs. Many parts of the United States spend far less money for Medicaid, Medicare than the high-spending areas. We know how to do this and, in fact, those low-spending,

high value areas provide better quality health care. Let's use the power of the Health Care Reform Act to accelerate those reforms and spread them around America, saving money and improving the quality of care.

Turn to the Tax Code. The American public would support a modest reasonable tax reform that would actually raise some revenue by closing unjustified tax loopholes and be able to deal with fairness and simplicity. More people would actually pay their taxes. We would have more revenue, and there would be more confidence in the system.

We should deal with our infrastructure deficit, something that doesn't get as much attention around here as it should. We have a serious deficiency in terms of basic infrastructure, transportation, sewer, water, trillions of dollars of a deficit that is building, undermining our competitiveness in a global economy. We would have modest user fees to support needed improvement, together with intelligent use of credit that would put hundreds of thousands of people to work, strengthening not just the economy, but improving our health and our global competitiveness.

We would reform agricultural spending. Those college students could figure out what the experts have told us: that we can actually provide more support for America's farmers and ranchers, improve the environment, put more resources into nutrition for our children in schools, all the time strengthening American agriculture, saving money. This isn't rocket science.

Finally, we would launch a very public American process on how to strengthen Social Security; protect that lifeline for our seniors in a way that brings people together rather than divides them. Any Rotary Club with 10 people, an Internet connection and a sheet of butcher paper could come up with one, two or three alternatives that would solve the problem over the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5401

next 50 years and would be acceptable to the American public.

This doesn't have to be so hard. It doesn't need to risk knocking the economy into another tailspin. Done right, we can meet our real challenges in a way that puts us on a sustainable economic path. We can rebuild and renew America, and unite our country to meet our challenges ahead.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Please hear our prayers for the Members of this assembly, upon whom the authority of government is given. Help them to understand the tremendous responsibility they have to represent both their constituencies and the people of this great Nation of ours.

This is a great but complex task. Grant them as well the gift of wisdom to sort through what competing interests might exist to work a solution that can serve all of the American people.

Finally, give each Member peace and equanimity and give all Americans generosity of heart to understand that governance is not simple but difficult work, at times requiring sacrifice and forbearance.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CLAY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANOTHER AMERICAN MURDERED IN MEXICO

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mexican bandits have killed yet another American. The reason: His family couldn't come up with the \$10,000 ransom.

Jorge Dieppa was a court translator for the Federal court in El Paso, Texas. He also was a lecturer at UTEP. Dieppa had gone to Juarez to get his car fixed, but he was kidnapped on July 6. When his relatives didn't pay the ransom, he was murdered. He was found bound with duct tape after being stabbed repeatedly.

Juarez is the border city of death. Thousands of Mexicans have been murdered there as well as several Americans. Rogue bandits and drug cartels rule the city. They rein terror on people through violence, racketeering, extortion, robbery, kidnapping, and drug deals.

The violence in "death city" is not the only border town with an atmosphere of outlawry. Other border towns such as Nuevo Laredo and Matamoros are dangerous for honest persons. Violence in Mexico affects the U.S. border towns with the cross-border crime, including reports of Americans with Spanish surnames being kidnapped and held for ransom.

Failure to realize that crime in "death city" and other Mexican border towns is real and expanding is to live like Alice in Wonderland.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA NEEDS WHITE HOUSE LEADERSHIP

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS. During Barack Obama's 2 years as a freshman Senator, America's debt increased \$400 billion. During Obama's next 2 years in the Senate majority, America's debt increased another \$1.8 trillion. As President, Barack Obama drove up America's debt another \$3 trillion. In Barack Obama's time in Washington, America's debt load has increased by more

than \$5 trillion. That's a 50 percent increase in just 6 years.

Do you see the pattern? The longer Obama is in Washington, the worse America's debt and the weaker America becomes.

What is President Obama's solution? Obama submits record-high budgets to Congress that continue Washington's unsustainable spending binge. Obama demands a debt ceiling increase with no spending cuts.

Mr. President, America needs White House leadership. If you have a written solution to this debt crisis, please submit it. The American people deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 22, 2011 at 3:28 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Res. 234.

That the Senate passed S. 300.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

□ 1210

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

(Mr. LANDRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity this weekend to go home to Louisiana, which I enjoyed doing. I heard from a State senator of mine who is also a banker. He said that he had a gentleman come in his office this weekend, asking for some more money on his loan. He said, Well, in order to do that, you have to give us some more information. We have to see your debt-to-income ratio—your assets versus your liabilities. So, after looking at that, he explained to him that, if the ratio doesn't work, he can't lend him any more money.

If you were to plug in that same ratio of what our Federal regulators are requiring of our financial institutions when they look upon the American people and American businesses, you would find that if we put that same set

of rules on this government that, basically, our Federal regulators would not let us borrow any more money.

The point of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a spending problem here in Washington. We cannot raise this debt ceiling unless we do three things: unless we cut, we cap, and we balance our budget.

THE TRUTH: AMERICA'S DEBT CEILING MUST BE RAISED

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend did what many of us did, my neighbor in Louisiana. I went home to Texas, and interacted with so many constituents, many of them asking the question: Why? I believe it's important to ask the question: Why not?

Let me tell you, my friends, that we don't need to politicize the debt ceiling, which has been raised many, many times, but we do need to tell the truth: for if the debt ceiling is not raised, trillions of dollars will be lost, not of those of us who sit on this floor, but from the portfolios and packages for seniors and 401(k)s.

If you want to talk about \$1 trillion, talk about what will be lost to our seniors and hardworking Americans in collapsing their 401(k)s. There is no option. There is not an option for the short term. That's a joke. That's politics to start us back again in April or March. Let's go forward with the proposed Reid plan. Let's get a deficit reduction; raise the debt ceiling; cut what we can and go into regular order. That is the responsible, adult way to go.

America is watching. America is looking. I am not going to stand by while trillions of dollars are lost. I ask my Republican friends to join us in a reasoned response to America's concerns.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2584, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 363 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 363

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to

the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill, as amended, back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole is as follows: Strike section 427.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2584. It allows any Member of the House to offer amendments which are germane and comply to the House rules. The rule allows priority recognition for the amendments that have been preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am pleased to support this resolution, which continues the record of our Rules Committee in this Congress of providing for as open and fair and orderly a process as possible.

□ 1220

I commend our chairman, Mr. DREIER, for continuing the record of fairness and openness in the formulation of this rule, which is in contrast to some rules that we have had in past years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2584 provides \$27.5 billion overall for programs within the Department of Interior and the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, the Indian Health Service, and other agencies. But it is a bill that strikes a fiscally responsible balance

between providing funds for ongoing Federal programs while also saving the taxpayers 7 percent over last year's enacted levels. It puts us back roughly to the 2009 levels.

There are some who will claim that there are certain programs that have been hurt heavily. It is true, for example, that the Environmental Protection Agency has an 18 percent reduction in funding in this bill. Please remember, though, that this was made possible simply because of unprecedentedly high record appropriations for EPA in 2009, of which \$3 billion remains unobligated.

In an era when 42 to 44 cents of every dollar that we spend goes for interest, it makes no sense in continuously overappropriating line items where money is not needed, not used, and sits there vacant.

This is a bill that oftentimes for those of us who live in the West has been full of riders year after year after year. It probably makes no difference here, but I realize that some are going to be very sensitive to this issue. I know the gentlelady from New York is very concerned about these potential issues that may be on this bill. And why should she not be? If you include the military, 0.8 percent of New York is owned by the Federal Government. I will contrast that with my State, which has 64 percent owned by the Federal Government. And we're not the highest.

This is an issue and a bill that is very important to those of us. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill; it is an extremely fair rule. It can't get any fairer than this one. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my colleague, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in these tough times we must make choices that reflect our values and our belief that we solve our toughest problems through shared sacrifice and working together. Unfortunately, today we consider yet another bill that is devoid of these values.

Once again, today's legislation places the burden on the American people while rewarding the special interests and the lobbyists who walk these halls.

One of the many riders inserted into the bill will effectively open up a million acres of national forest and other public land around the Grand Canyon National Park because people want to mine uranium there.

Democrats have great concerns about maintaining the integrity of the Grand Canyon and the effect of uranium mining on water quality, not to mention the spectacle that shows us auctioning off a national treasure with the proceeds going to mostly foreign-owned entities.

Who is it that wants to drill for uranium and mine for uranium? Russia, their state atomic energy corporation, and South Korea's state-owned utility.

In other words, we will give up the Grand Canyon and potable water, likely, to benefit the Russians and South Koreans. And any mining that is included in this bill comes under a bill that was signed by Ulysses S. Grant in 1872. We have not raised royalties on anything that anybody takes from us, including foreign entities as they come here to mine our resources.

At the same time, the majority proposes crippling cuts to the EPA that will cut programs that protect our air and water. There are few more important responsibilities in making sure when we go to the kitchen sink that the water coming out is safe. We know a human being may live as long as he or she may without food—four days without water. If our Nation can't protect these most basic of our life necessities, we have indeed fallen far.

Today's bill would also prohibit the use of government moneys to add animals to the Endangered Species List but allows the use of government money to take species off the same list. This policy change threatens the Endangered Species Act and the environmental protections that come with it.

The misguided priorities in this bill will directly impact my district, and my colleague is right about that, and the citizens I am elected to represent. But not just them.

Twenty percent of the freshwater on this planet resides in the Great Lakes. Most of us who live around the Great Lakes believe it is our responsibility to take care of them and to pass it on to future generations. But in recent years, the Great Lakes have been damaged by pollution and invasive species carried on to our water by foreign vessels. We have allowed that.

New York, of course, being closest to the Atlantic Ocean and the St. Lawrence Seaway, has enacted stronger laws against dumping ballast, and this bill punishes us for doing that.

The invasive species are not damaging just an ecosystem but a way of life for the Great Lakes communities that line the shore, as well as endangering our freshwater. The EPA has come to the aid of these communities by dedicating funding to restore the Great Lakes. But today's bill would bar New York State from receiving any restoration funding from the EPA and leave the Great Lakes to be overrun by private polluters and the invasive species they have delivered from overseas.

Any bill that stands up for foreign shipping magnates but won't provide a cent to help Americans should never see the light of day and will never receive my vote.

Today's legislation also harms the arts. If today's bill takes effect, the National Endowment for the Arts will have lost 20 percent of its funding in 2 years. Now, these cuts target a program that works. In fiscal year 2010, we invested \$167.5 million into the NEA—remember that number, \$167.5—for the purpose of providing funding to non-profit arts organizations.

The funding created \$166.2 billion in total economic activity, supported 5.7 million jobs, and, for the \$167 million, generated back \$12.6 billion in tax revenue to the United States Treasury. And that does not count what happens to help improvements to States' treasuries and local treasuries.

Today's legislation targets a program proven to create jobs and contribute to the economic and the cultural well-being of our Nation. You would think that people who are elected to the Congress of the United States would really want a program like that not only to survive but to grow. But, no, here they are cutting the budget once again.

Our country is blessed with stunning natural beauty and a wealth of natural resources that are unparalleled anywhere in the world. But in one final swipe at our national interest, today's bill cuts the budget for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by a whopping 78 percent. The Land and Water Conservation Fund ensures that our national treasures will be here for our children and our grandchildren, a mission that apparently deserves 78 percent less money than it did the year before. A cut like that says all you need to know about the priorities of the majority and the special interests that are being served.

If getting our fiscal house in order is truly about shared sacrifices, this bill does not reflect it. We could have started by asking oil and gas companies to pay their fair share after profiting so richly from resources found on American soil. Instead, the majority rejected an amendment that would have asked oil and gas companies to pay a little more so the Nation can fund programs to clean up the most polluted lands in our country. The majority will not even allow this amendment to receive a vote on the floor.

Today's bill asks nothing of the companies that are making record profits. Instead, cuts to programs and services and the agencies that serve the American people and protect our environment for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, a bill like this does not reflect our values. It is not up to the standards the American people have come to expect and deserve. It puts special interests over our general welfare, and it fails totally to invest in our future. We can and we must do better.

I am pleased to now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York, the ranking Democrat on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP.

□ 1230

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. As every member of the Rules Committee knows, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill that we will debate today simply violates the rules of the House. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee has

waived all points of order against the bill, preventing Members from striking provisions that are clearly in violation of House rules.

In particular, title V of the bill includes the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, H.R. 872, a bill that amends the Clean Water Act, which is solely within the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member.

Furthermore, the provision amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, better known as FIFRA, that is under the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee.

As we all know, advancing authorizing legislation within an appropriations vehicle is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and it stands in stark contrast to clause 2(b) of rule XXI of the House rules, which states, in part, "A provision changing existing law may not be reported in a general appropriation bill"; and yet that is precisely what title V is: a change in existing law.

Not only is the inclusion of title V in the underlying bill a violation of House rules, but it is also legislatively redundant. The House has already passed H.R. 872 earlier this year under suspension of the rules. The bill is now being considered in the Senate, where it has been reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

In my opinion, including H.R. 872 in the Interior appropriations bill will hamper negotiations between Senators and between the House and the Senate to get a final bill that everyone can be disappointed with—frankly, that's what's at stake here—but that can pass both Chambers and be enacted into law before the court-ordered deadline of October 31, 2011. Let me say that again: There is a court-ordered deadline of October 31, 2011, to resolve this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I will be offering an amendment to strike title V when it comes up during debate this week. However, I am deeply disappointed that the Rules Committee has blatantly ignored the rules of the House by eliminating the ability of Members to raise a point of order against provisions of an appropriations bill that changes existing law.

There are approximately 39 policy riders included in the Interior appropriations bill. And let's be clear: These are policy earmarks, and these earmarks undermine the jurisdiction of authorizing committees and undermine the ability of the House and the Senate to work its will. It is unfortunate that the Rules Committee is protecting these new earmarks from the rules of the House.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We find that this particular bill is a great illustration of one of the problems that we have here in the House of

Representatives and, indeed, with government. Our land policy in the United States is one historically that had no purpose or organization to it. It simply happened. But what happened happened disproportionately throughout this country, which is why 1 out of every 3 acres in America is now owned by the Federal Government.

I defy anyone on that side to find for any a constitutional provision that would allow that ownership; but, nonetheless, it is.

The unfortunate thing is it is disproportionate. One out of every 2 acres in the West is owned by the Federal Government. That means 52 percent of the area west of Denver is owned by the Federal Government. Four percent of the area east of Denver is owned by the Federal Government, much of that in military installations.

As I said, the State of New York has 0.3 percent of its land owned by the Federal Government, 0.8 percent if you include military. The State of Virginia has 8 percent owned by the Federal Government, almost all military. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who will be here as well, 1.1 percent of his State is owned by the Federal Government.

And so it means different issues for my State, which is 65 percent owned by the Federal Government; Alaska; Nevada, which is almost 90 percent owned by the Federal Government; Idaho, which is over 60 percent owned by the Federal Government. Things take place differently.

That's why, for example, things like the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a nice fund if it were used to preserve what we already have. Unfortunately, that fund is used to buy more territory, with an administration decision and mindset that no land should ever be given back or given up; more should be accumulated. That's why it's the ability of this appropriations bill to try to put that money—not simply to cut it, but to move it into preservation as opposed to access to buying more land, which makes sense to us in the West because we recognize this heavy-handed tyranny that takes place.

Let me just give you one simple example that was brought up here that deals with uranium mining in Arizona, one of the so-called "riders" in this particular appropriations bill. It takes place in what is called the Arizona Strip, which has led some people to mistakenly think that we were going to be strip mining around the Grand Canyon.

The Arizona Strip is the size of the State of New Jersey. That is the area between Utah and the Colorado River. In that area in 1984, Morris Udall, who was at the time the chairman of the Resources Committee here in the House, created a wilderness compromise in which a wilderness area was to be created in the State of Arizona. In that, 56 percent of the State of Arizona was put off limits to any kind of

mining endeavors whatsoever. In exchange, certain areas were put specifically for those types of mining areas, including areas in the Arizona Strip, this New Jersey-sized piece of the State of Arizona. The unfortunate thing is it was always intended to be used there for mining purposes because there is a great deal of uranium ore there.

Unlike other kinds of mining, this ore is found in little pipes, strips within the ground that go up and down. And what you need to do is simply bore into the pipe, find the ore in the middle, take it out, and then replace all the stuff back in. So once you are done with that mine, no one ever sees that it was there in the first place. The ore that is taken out is not left in Arizona. It's actually going to be shipped for processing somewhere else. So there will be no tailings. There will be no wind pollution. There will be no dust issues whatsoever.

Certain special interest groups said, well, it could change the water quality that goes through Colorado and then would eventually flow to Las Vegas and do something strange in Las Vegas, as if that were ever possible. Unfortunately, as stated by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, their mines and mining groups, there have been certain interest groups that have inferred, with no substantive supporting data, that groundwater in this particular area of the Colorado River may be contaminated by uranium mining. That simply won't happen, and it won't happen because of where the ore is. The ore is found 100 feet below the surface. There is only 12 inches of rain a year there. There is no particular kind of any runoff that will take place. It is also found 1,000 feet above the aquifer with clay underneath, so there is no way there can be any kind of leaching that goes into the aquifer.

The bottom line is there will never, never be any kind of contamination on this water, which was the excuse used to justify a political reason for taking this land that had been part of the '84 agreement off the table, and it could not be used again.

Unfortunately, the EPA gets involved in this one again because they have determined that if the uranium—or whatever they call the uranium—gets into the water and it's more than 30 parts per billion, that's unsafe. Unfortunately, there are uranium pipes within the Grand Canyon itself which already erode into the water, and it creates a situation where, naturally occurring, there are 4 parts per billion. So they did some testing at existing mines up in the Kanab Creek area to find out what would happen if actually some of this uranium were to leach into the water, and it would increase that 4 number to 6 parts per billion.

In essence, what they are saying is: You could take all of the tailings that could come from these potential mines and dump them into the Colorado

River, and you still would not reach the level set by the EPA for drinking water. In fact, the uranium that naturally occurs in the Colorado River, even if you had a catastrophe, is still lower than uranium levels found in freshwater lakes in the desert area.

Now, why isn't all that considered? Because the decision to withdraw that area from mining was not based on science. If it were based on science, then the Department of Environmental Quality of Arizona would not have testified that there was no scientific basis for it. The State of Arizona would not have passed a piece of legislation decrying the withdrawal of that particular area. The guy who was actually part of the National Parks Conservation Association as well as the Audubon Society and the Save the Redwoods League, who was actually the one that did the scientific study in '84 when the original design by Mo Udall was made, simply said there was no legitimate evidence to say there could be any contamination of that air, which basically means the withdrawal of this land was done for political purposes, not scientific purposes.

So to put a provision back into this bill saying that if you're going to do this kind of stuff, it had darn well better be on a scientific basis and not a political basis makes sense. It's one of the right things to do in here.

□ 1240

I realize we have some other speakers here; so I'm not going to take all the time yet, but I would desperately like to talk about the clean water provisions, the navigable water provisions and what EPA does with those because it has a different impact on those of us in the West, where almost all of our land is controlled by them, versus those in the East, where almost no land is controlled by them and they have a great deal of freedom to develop the resources on their own.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond for a minute before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I have, from the Las Vegas Sun of July 22, an article saying that the previous allowing of uranium mining has caused great damage. This watershed gives water to 26 million people and provides 90 percent of the water used in southern Nevada.

Let me quote from the paper:

"As it is, the Colorado River is already endangered by the uranium mines"—which the gentleman talked about has not hurt anybody at all—"that sit in the watershed, some perilously close to the water. The moratorium also doesn't prevent existing mining claims from being developed. The Interior Department says there are about 3,500 claims in the area. Adding the potential for more uranium to enter the water doesn't make sense. Republicans in Congress should quit

trying to repeal the moratorium and should instead work to protect the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River. It makes no sense to put millions of people's drinking water at risk."

I will put that in the RECORD, if I may, and a New York Times editorial of June 28, "Mining and the Canyon." Absolute harm is being done.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, June 22, 2011]

REPUBLICANS SHOULD QUIT TRYING TO ROLL BACK URANIUM MINING MORATORIUM

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar in June issued a six-month moratorium on new uranium mining claims on 1 million acres near the Grand Canyon. The ban provides time for the government to complete a study of the effects of uranium mining in the area.

A final report is due this fall, and Salazar said the department is considering banning new mining claims in the area for the next 20 years.

The issue is important. Uranium mining threatens not only the beauty and ecosystem of the Grand Canyon, but it also poses a threat to the Colorado River, which is a key source of water for about 26 million people in Arizona, Nevada and California. The Colorado River, which forms Lake Mead, provides 90 percent of the water used in Southern Nevada.

Salazar cited a concern for water quality in announcing the moratorium extension because the 1 million acres are in the Colorado River watershed. Water officials worry that more uranium mines could result in radioactive material streaming into the river.

The Grand Canyon and the Colorado River need to be protected. The moratorium on new claims was put in place because of an incredible spike in mining interest in the area under the George W. Bush administration. The Grand Canyon doesn't need to see any more mining around it.

Environmental groups and Colorado River water users cheered Salazar's decision, but in Congress, Salazar's announcement was targeted by some Republicans who claimed it was a bad policy.

In a news release issued this month, Rep. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., boasted about inserting a provision to block the administration from enforcing the moratorium in the spending bill that covers the Interior Department. The bill passed the House Appropriations Committee this month. Flake claimed that mining "can create jobs and stimulate the economy in Northern Arizona."

But Flake's argument is shameless. He is using the nation's poor economy as an excuse to force a dangerous policy on the country.

Flake's argument is part of the larger Republican attempt to roll back any sort of regulation. In passing the interior spending bill from his committee, Appropriations Chairman Hal Rogers complained about what he called the administration's "widespread regulatory overreach" and pledged to cut it.

But when it comes to clean water, Congress shouldn't be cutting back. People need to be confident their water supply is protected, and if the Republican plan moves forward, there will be serious doubt.

As it is, the Colorado River is already endangered by uranium mines and tailing piles that sit in the watershed, some perilously close to the water. The moratorium also doesn't prevent existing mining claims from being developed. The Interior Department says there are about 3,500 hard-rock mining claims in the area. Adding the potential for more uranium to enter the water doesn't make sense.

Republicans in Congress should quit trying to repeal the moratorium and should instead

work to protect the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River. It makes no sense to put millions of people's drinking water at risk.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 2011]

MINING AND THE CANYON

The Obama administration has extended for six months a 2009 moratorium on new uranium mining claims on one million acres around the Grand Canyon. This is good news; even better is the promise from Ken Salazar, the interior secretary, that he will soon recommend a 20-year ban on new claims in the region. That is the maximum allowed under the 1872 mining law.

With uranium prices rising, the number of mining claims have jumped sharply over the last few years. There have been about 3,500 claims in the Grand Canyon-area alone. If developed, they would generate toxic wastes that would threaten the Colorado River—the source of drinking water for roughly 27 million people—the aquifer and the Grand Canyon ecosystem in general.

Mr. Salazar said he could not cancel valid existing claims, but there is likely to be little actual mining. The decision to "withdraw" the land from future claims creates new regulatory hurdles for existing claimants, who must demonstrate, among other things, that they had discovered actual mineral deposits before the 2009 moratorium. Only a handful have been able to do so.

There have been the usual complaints from mining lobbyists and their Congressional allies. Representative Jeff Flake, a Republican from Arizona, has threatened to use the interior appropriations bill to block Mr. Salazar's plan. The moratorium will have little effect on the country's uranium supply, most of which comes from Wyoming and New Mexico.

It will protect a treasured national park and the drinking water for millions of people.

I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the ranking member, the gentlelady from New York, for yielding me the time.

I rise today to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have two children, ages 13 and 10, and one of our favorite things to do as a family is to go hiking. We have hiked all over this great country. We have a love and a respect for our open spaces and for our environment. Unfortunately, the Republicans' fiscal year 2012 Interior appropriations bill throws that into grave danger.

This Interior appropriations bill represents an unprecedented departure from our Nation's decades-long bipartisan commitment to protecting our shared environment, magnificent natural resources and our cherished cultural treasures. It's a shame that my Republican colleagues prioritize tax breaks and incentives for highly profitable oil companies over the Grand Canyon, the Cape Cod National Seashore, State parks, and even public health.

Mr. Speaker, I could be here all day talking about the harmful cuts and misplaced priorities that are included in this bill: from the more than 25 policy riders that do not belong in an appropriations bill, that do everything from gutting the Endangered Species

Act to allowing uranium drilling by foreign companies alongside the Grand Canyon, to the harsh cuts in EPA funding that will result in millions of Americans being exposed to dirtier air and dirtier water.

I give my Republican colleagues credit. They have left no stone unturned in their environmental assault. Unfortunately, though, that stone will be covered in toxic algae, coal ash, and polluted water if they have their way.

One of the most egregious cuts in this bill is to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been one of the greatest conservation success stories over the past 50 years, protecting thousands and thousands of acres of land at the Federal and State levels. States rely on this funding and demonstrate their commitment to its value by providing matching funding for State park and recreational purposes. Not only that, but the Land and Water Conservation Fund has a dedicated source of funding derived from oil and gas leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf and is authorized to accumulate \$900 million annually from its dedicated sources. Nonetheless, my Republican friends forget all of this and still slash the Land and Water Conservation Fund funding by 78 percent from the current fiscal year. This represents the lowest level of funding in the 45-year history of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. What's most troubling is that, in the committee report, my Republican colleagues acknowledge the enormous value of the Land and Water Conservation Fund but then go right ahead and decimate its budget.

The bill also cuts clean water and safe drinking water grant programs by nearly 40 percent, threatening Americans' ability to access clean water and adding to the already significant backlog of safe drinking water infrastructure projects.

Look, I know it's politically popular to demonize the EPA right now, and at times I've had my own strong disagreements with the EPA on certain issues, but this Interior appropriations bill is not the way to meaningfully address any of those disagreements. This bill puts the priorities of special interests and scoring cheap political points over public health and our natural resources. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that these are tough budgetary times, but what troubles me about the Republicans' approach to this appropriations process is that so many of their cuts are aimed at programs that will lower the standard of living and lessen the quality of life for a majority of Americans. This appropriations process should be about lifting people up, not putting people down, and it should be about a decent respect for our environment, and certainly a respect for our environment over corporate special interests.

When we talk about protecting our environment, we're talking about quality of life issues that impact every single person in this country. This bill undermines our historic bipartisan commitment to our environment.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am once again appreciative that data from newspaper articles were put into the RECORD, because the newspapers have a tendency of quoting one another and also quoting environmental groups. Unfortunately, the data still says the same thing from those who know, the scientific community, that actually knows what they're talking about, who said:

"A few environmental groups claim, without providing any scientific supporting data, that the groundwater in the Colorado would be contaminated with uranium mining. We conclude that even the most implausible accident would increase the amount of uranium in the Colorado River by an amount that is undetectable over those that occur there normally."

Another said: "I continue to view such activities as posing no credible threat of environmental harm to either the Grand Canyon National Park or the Colorado River that flows through it. I can see no credible justification for a 1.1 million-acre withdrawal from mineral entry of lands to the north and south of the park."

Another said: "It is important to note that the research conducted by the United States Geological Survey and the preliminary findings by the University of Arizona confirm uranium exploration and mining pose no threat to the Grand Canyon watershed or the park."

This is the study. This is the scientific data. It would be nice if, for once, we used this data instead of quoting one another and quoting things that have no basis in science.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and final passage of the bill. In a time when government is borrowing over 40 cents for every dollar it spends, this bill makes needed cuts and puts forward a responsible and sensible framework for managing our Nation's natural resources.

I represent a vast district in northern Michigan that includes Federal forests, national parks, and three Great Lakes. I am particularly pleased that the committee included language to boost and streamline timber harvests in Federal forests, similar to legislation that I introduced earlier this year.

Right now on the Federal forests, for them to plan a timber harvest takes nearly 8 years to complete a harvest, from the beginning of the attempt to sell a parcel of land for timber and the

actual harvesting; whereas, certified sustainable State forests take less than 2 years and certified sustainable county forests take a year.

Basically it comes down to jobs in my district. We have a lot of Federal land in northern Michigan, and people in my district depend on the timber industry for jobs. Every little town has a mill, a flooring mill. Jobs, high-paying jobs, and the frustration that comes from having a forest full of timber and being unable to harvest it because of onerous regulations and rules result in a less healthy forest and less jobs for northern Michigan.

We have a long way to go to responsibly harvest timber in northern Michigan and elsewhere in this country, but I believe this is a good start, and I am certainly looking forward to working with this committee in the future to continue to promote jobs in northern Michigan.

□ 1250

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We're always being told what's junk science in here, but I will tell you right now, I really think that the science is very strong, and thank goodness there's a moratorium on this mining around the Grand Canyon.

I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who will make it very clear.

Mr. MARKEY. This spending bill represents one of the most egregious assaults on our Nation's environment in the history of our country. If this bill were to pass, our air will be smoggier. Our climate will be hotter. Our water will be more polluted. Our public lands will become more despoiled.

Simply put, this legislation is so toxic, H.R. 2584 is so toxic, that you'd better handle it wearing a hazmat suit because there are so many future environmental crimes committed against the environment in our country that you have to handle this bill with extreme care.

The actual title of this bill is Interior Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations for 2012. But it could be called the Have the Republicans Been Outside Act.

It's hot, ladies and gentlemen. It is hot. The world is warming. All of the evidence has been pointing in this direction for decades, and people are living it on a daily basis.

It's appropriate that this bill starts with the word "interior," because only the House Republicans who have been cooped up inside for weeks debating whether to crater our economy could possibly ignore what's going on outside in our natural environment.

The weather forecasters said we were trapped under a heat dome last week. Well, the Republican majority, under this Capitol dome, would commit us to even more dangerous heat if this bill passes.

And believe it or not, this bill bans the Environmental Protection Agency from increasing the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive in our country, which will basically put the brakes on the all-electric vehicle, plug-in hybrid revolution.

Now, I know that's what the auto industry wants. I know that's what the oil industry wants. They don't want to see cars become more and more efficient so we don't have to consume all that oil so that we can tell OPEC we don't need their oil any more than we need their sand.

But in this bill, they actually ban the EPA from improving the fuel economy standards of the vehicles that we drive, and they ban all 50 States from improving the efficiency of the vehicles that we drive.

And how else could you explain that this bill would increase smog and dirty air days if you didn't have the House Republicans living in their own world?

When families are planning their summer trips to explore our national parks, how else could you explain a bill that allows for mining of nuclear fuel uranium near Grand Canyon National Park?

Under this bill, when families go to enjoy the sunset across the canyon, it won't just be the sun that's causing the glow, but the radiation as well from the uranium mining.

And when Americans are canceling vacations because they can't pay for gas, how else can you explain a bill that would tell auto companies to stop making more fuel-efficient cars and trucks?

If you live in an air conditioned mansion with an indoor pool and you have your bottled water delivered, then this bill makes perfect sense to you, especially if you also work for the oil, coal mining, or chemical industries. For those industries, this bill represents their summer vacation from regulation. For the rest of us, it is a one-way ticket to a dirtier environment for the United States of America.

House Republicans have a tough time raising the debt ceiling, but with this bill they are proving to have no reservations when it comes to raising the death ceiling with more pollution in our air, in our water, making us less healthy, making us more likely to be able to contract diseases that we would not otherwise.

It is bad enough that the House Republicans want to take Medicare away from grandma, but now they want to make the air she and her grandkids breathe and the water they drink more polluted. This bill would cause more premature deaths, more asthma, more harm to children from toxins like mercury.

Yes, they don't want to lift the debt ceiling, but they will be lifting the death ceiling because of the exposure to all of these chemicals, all of these pollutants.

Vote "no" on the Republican appropriations bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I know that what we do here on the floor is often riveting drama for those who are watching on television. Let me, in some respects, not try to add to that drama and go back to facts, something we don't necessarily like around here.

We've already talked about this so-called uranium issue showing facts. The chart that we just saw from the gentleman from Massachusetts was an interesting chart. The area of the United States that was colored on that chart is the area that there are those in this administration, indeed, on this floor, want to be owned by the Federal Government here.

Let me talk to you just a moment—and I'll even grant some time to the gentlelady from New York if she could actually answer this one—and talk about what some of these issues do to those of us who live under what Nelson Rockefeller called the "deadening hand of bureaucracy" because, once again, in the East you don't have to deal with these situations; in the West we do.

Let me talk about simply the Environmental Protection Agency and some of the brilliant things they do in the name of trying to clean up our water and our air and make life more livable for us. One of the suburbs of my community—and I call it a suburb simply because my community only has, what, 18,000 people in it; so I like calling it a suburb—has no rivers, no creeks, no streams, no anything. It does have irrigation ditches. Starting at the top of the mountain, the irrigation water flows down so it covers all the fields, as normally you would want to do.

We passed legislation for the Clean Water Act allowing the Federal Government, especially the EPA, to come in and monitor water that is navigable water systems on interstate commerce. The Great Salt Lake in Utah is all confined in the State of Utah. There are no outlets. That's why it's salty. There is nothing more intra-navigable than the Great Salt Lake.

But because in the 1880s some of the pioneers used to ship sheep over there for summer grazing on the islands in the Great Salt Lake, it is now part of the interstate commerce system and part of the navigable water system of the United States, therefore controllable by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Now, let's see what they did in my particular community. In this community where there were irrigation ditches, the overflow from the irrigation ditches ran down, and the Environmental Protection Agency said the runoff from those irrigation ditches would eventually go into the Great Salt Lake; therefore, that runoff from a ditch was part of the navigable water systems of the United States and controllable as wetlands by the Environmental Protection Agency, even though that irrigation runoff to get to the Great Salt Lake would actually have to run down the mountain,

through a culvert for the city road, through one for the train tracks, through one that was the side road of the freeway, through the northbound freeway, through the barrel pit, through the southbound freeway, through another one of the adjacent roads to the southbound freeway, up a 3 percent grade to an area that had been previously determined to be not wetlands area, and eventually into the Bear River system which was stopped from going to the Great Salt Lake by the Bear River Bird Refuge.

□ 1300

They claim that could happen. And because of that, the water from the irrigation system was navigable waters of the United States and the Environmental Protection Agency claimed jurisdiction over it, which meant that the citizens of that community could not expand their sewer system. Instead, they had to take money out of their pockets to ship their sewage either to Brigham City or Willard because the Environmental Protection Agency now controlled the navigable waters because we gave them the power to do that under the Clean Water Act.

One of the things I am talking about here and one of the frustrations we have illustrated by this bill is, unfortunately, time after time these agencies funded in this bill do not consider what they do to real people. Real people in my community are being harmed time after time by decisions made from bureaucrats sitting here in Washington, and then we wonder why we rail against these environmental groups, why we rail against these agencies, and why we don't want to have some kind of control over this process. And the only vehicle we seem to have is the appropriation bill.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is used to buy more land to get more control; if it were not, we would not complain about it. The EPA is used to get more control over people's lives, and they hurt people in the process. If it were not so, we would not complain about it. The withdrawing of uranium mining on the Arizona strip was done, despite all the scientific testimony, for political reasons. Were it not done so, we would not complain about it.

This is a decent bill, which moves us a step forward to try to control our spending habit, dealing with what is really the core issue and core responsibility of our agencies and trying not to harm people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. May I inquire how much time actually remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To the gentlelady from New York, I have a brilliant

11-minute speech welling within my bosom; but if you are willing to close, I will be willing to close as well.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you for that, and I am willing to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with this: I think we have demonstrated that this bill contains an astonishing array of devastating cuts and special interest riders that jeopardize the water we drink, the air we breathe, and our country's national heritage.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I think we've also proven in this bill that we are moving in the right direction to try to control the excesses that continuously take place here and still maintain the core responsibilities that have to be there, and we have done it in a rule that is adamantly fair. It is an open rule that will allow anyone to bring anything down here to the floor until we do a UC agreement that stops it. It is a good rule, and I urge adoption of that particular rule.

In closing, I will once again reiterate the fairness of this open rule. I urge its adoption, and I urge the adoption of the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REQUESTING RETURN OF OFFICIAL PAPERS ON H.R. 1309

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 368

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives request the Senate to return to the House the bill (H.R. 1309) entitled "An Act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob

J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed, as follows:

Adopting House Resolution 363 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2584, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 363) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 131, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 630]

YEAS—205

Adams	Chaffetz	Gibson
Aderholt	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Akin	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Alexander	Conaway	Goodlatte
Amash	Cravaack	Gowdy
Austria	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Barletta	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Bartlett	Dent	Grimm
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Guinta
Benishke	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Biggert	Dreier	Hall
Bilbray	Duffy	Hanna
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Black	Emerson	Hayworth
Blackburn	Farenthold	Heck
Bonner	Fincher	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Fitzpatrick	Heger
Boustany	Flake	Herrera Beutler
Brooks	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Flores	Hultgren
Buerkle	Forbes	Hunter
Burgess	Fortenberry	Hurt
Calvert	Fox	Issa
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Canseco	Galleghy	Johnson (OH)
Cantor	Gardner	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Garrett	Jones
Carter	Gerlach	Jordan
Chabot	Gibbs	Kelly

King (NY)	Nunes	Schmidt	Labrador	Olver	Sánchez, Linda
Kingston	Nunnelee	Schock	Lamborn	Owens	T.
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Schweikert	Larson (CT)	Paul	Schakowsky
Kline	Palazzo	Scott (SC)	Lipinski	Payne	Scott, David
Lance	Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Loebach	Pelosi	Sensenbrenner
Landry	Pearce	Sessions	Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Shuler
Lankford	Pence	Shimkus	Lungren, Daniel	Possey	Smith (WA)
Latham	Petri	Shuster	E.	Price (NC)	Stearns
LaTourette	Pitts	Simpson	Mack	Quigley	Sullivan
Latta	Platts	Smith (NE)	Maloney	Richardson	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	Marchant	Rohrabacher	Velázquez
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Walsh (IL)
Long	Price (GA)	Southerland	McDermott	Ross (AR)	Waters
Lucas	Quayle	Stivers	McNerney	Rothman (NJ)	Watt
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Stutzman	Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lummis	Rehberg	Terry	Myrick	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Manzullo	Reichert	Thompson (PA)	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
Marino	Renacci	Thornberry	Napolitano		Young (FL)
McCaul	Ribble	Tipton			
McClintock	Rigell	Turner			
McCotter	Rivera	Upton			
McHenry	Roby	Walberg			
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Walden			
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Webster			
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	West			
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland			
Meehan	Rokita	Whitfield			
Mica	Rooney	Wilson (SC)			
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)	Womack			
Mulvaney	Royce	Woodall			
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Yoder			
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
Noem	Scalise	Young (IN)			
Nugent	Schilling				

NAYS—131

Ackerman	Hahn	Murphy (CT)
Altmire	Hanabusa	Neal
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Barrow	Heinrich	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peters
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Peterson
Boswell	Hochul	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Holden	Polis
Butterfield	Holt	Rahall
Capps	Honda	Rangel
Capuano	Hoyer	Reyes
Cardoza	Inslee	Richmond
Carnahan	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Sánchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Schiff
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Schrader
Cielline	Johnson, E. B.	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Serrano
Clay	Kildee	Sewell
Cleaver	Kind	Sherman
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sires
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Slaughter
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Speier
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Stark
Costa	Levin	Sutton
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Critz	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	Lujan	Tierney
Cuellar	Lynch	Tonko
Cummings	Markey	Towns
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tsongas
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Deutch	McCollum	Walz (MN)
Dicks	McGovern	Wasserman
Doggett	McIntyre	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Waxman
Edwards	Michaud	Woolsey
Filner	Miller (NC)	Wu
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Yarmuth
Fudge	Moore	
Grijalva	Moran	

NOT VOTING—96

Baca	Chandler	Fattah
Bachmann	Cohen	Garamendi
Baldwin	Cole	Giffords
Barton (TX)	Costello	Gonzalez
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gosar
Berg	Davis (KY)	Granger
Berkley	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Berman	DeGette	Green, Al
Boren	Dingell	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Dold	Gutierrez
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Hartzler
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Hinchey
Buchanan	Engel	Hirono
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	King (IA)
Cassidy	Farr	Kissell

□ 1337

Ms. WOOLSEY and Messrs. MORAN and CARNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WEBSTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 630, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following vote. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote 630, on agreeing to the resolution—H. Res. 363, providing for consideration of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes—I would have voted "yea."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was unavoidably detained and missed the first vote in a series of two votes. I missed rollcall vote No. 630. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote No. 630: "yea" (On agreeing to H. Res. 363).

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 630. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 363—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2584—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 because it waives all points of order against the bill. H.R. 2584 includes many harmful policy riders that violate the House rules by legislating on an appropriations bill.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the following vote: H. Res. 363—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2584—Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this resolution.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 630. If present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 630.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 108, answered “present” 2, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 631]

YEAS—233

Aderholt	Gallegly	Paulsen
Akin	Gingrey (GA)	Pence
Alexander	Goodlatte	Petri
Austria	Gowdy	Pingree (ME)
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Barletta	Green, Al	Platts
Barrow	Griffin (AR)	Polis
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Bass (NH)	Grimm	Price (GA)
Becerra	Guinta	Quayle
Benishek	Guthrie	Rangel
Biggert	Hall	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Harper	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Black	Hayworth	Rivera
Blackburn	Heinrich	Roby
Blumenauer	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bonner	Herger	Rogers (AL)
Bono Mack	Higgins	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hinojosa	Rogers (MI)
Brooks	Hochul	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney
Bucshon	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Buerkle	Hunter	Ross (FL)
Butterfield	Hurt	Royce
Calvert	Inslee	Runyan
Camp	Issa	Ruppersberger
Campbell	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Canseco	Johnson (GA)	Scalise
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Schiff
Capps	Johnson, Sam	Schmidt
Carnahan	Jones	Schock
Carney	Jordan	Schrader
Carter	Kaptur	Schwartz
Cassidy	Kelly	Schweikert
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Scott (SC)
Chabot	King (NY)	Scott (VA)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Scott, Austin
Cicilline	Kline	Scott, David
Clarke (MI)	Lance	Serrano
Clay	Langevin	Sessions
Cleaver	Lankford	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Coble	LaTourette	Shimkus
Coffman (CO)	Latta	Shuster
Cole	Levin	Simpson
Connolly (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conyers	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Critz	Lujan	Speier
Cuellar	Manzullo	Stutzman
Culberson	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Cummings	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Davis (IL)	McCaul	Turner
DeLauro	McClintock	Upton
Denham	McCollum	Van Hollen
DesJarlais	McHenry	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	McIntyre	Walden
Doggett	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Dreier	McKinley	Walz (MN)
Duncan (SC)	Meehan	Wasserman
Duncan (TN)	Mica	Schultz
Edwards	Michaud	Waxman
Ellmers	Miller (MI)	Webster
Emerson	Moore	West
Farenthold	Moran	Westmoreland
Fincher	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Flake	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Fleming	Myrick	Wolf
Flores	Neugebauer	Womack
Fortenberry	Nunes	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nunnelee	Yarmuth
Franks (AZ)	Olson	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Palazzo	Young (IN)

NAYS—108

Ackerman	Boswell	Clarke (NY)
Adams	Brady (PA)	Conaway
Altire	Burgess	Costa
Andrews	Capuano	Courtney
Bass (CA)	Cardoza	Cravaack
Bilbray	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Dent

Deutch	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Dicks	(TX)	Pascarell
Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)
Duffy	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Filner	Keating	Peters
Fitzpatrick	Kind	Peterson
Forbes	Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)
Fox	Kucinich	Rahall
Fudge	Landry	Reed
Gardner	Larsen (WA)	Renacci
Garrett	Latham	Reyes
Gerlach	Lee (CA)	Richmond
Gibbs	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gibson	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Grijalva	Lowey	Schilling
Hahn	Lummis	Slaughter
Hanna	Lynch	Stark
Harris	Maloney	Stivers
Hastings (FL)	Markey	Sutton
Heck	Matheson	Terry
Herrera Beutler	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Himes	McCotter	Thompson (MS)
Holden	McGovern	Tierney
Holt	Meeks	Tipton
Honda	Miller (FL)	Towns
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Huelskamp	Miller, George	Woodall
Israel	Neal	Wu
Jackson (IL)	Noem	Young (AK)
	Nugent	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Amash

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—89

Baca	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Bachmann	Gosar	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Granger	Posey
Barton (TX)	Graves (MO)	Price (NC)
Berg	Green, Gene	Quigley
Berkley	Gutierrez	Richardson
Berman	Hartzler	Rohrabacher
Boren	Hinchey	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Hirono	Ross (AR)
Braley (IA)	King (IA)	Rothman (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Kissell	Roybal-Allard
Buchanan	Labrador	Rush
Burton (IN)	Lamborn	Ryan (OH)
Cantor	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Loebsack	T.
Cohen	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Costello	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	E.	Shuler
Davis (KY)	Mack	Sires
DeFazio	Marchant	Smith (WA)
DeGette	McDermott	Stearns
Dingell	McMorris	Sullivan
Dold	Rodgers	Tiberi
Doyle	McNerney	Tonko
Ellison	Miller, Gary	Velázquez
Engel	Nadler	Waters
Eshoo	Napolitano	Watt
Farr	Oliver	Welch
Fattah	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Paul	Young (FL)
Giffords	Payne	

□ 1347

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my flight was delayed on July 25, 2011 and I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall vote Nos. 630 and 631. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 25, 2011, I was not present for votes 630 and 631. Had I been present for rollcall 630, I would have voted no. Had I been present for rollcall 631, I would have voted yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House

Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 630 and 631.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 2011, I was not present for two recorded votes because my flight from Iowa to Washington, DC was significantly delayed. I had returned to Iowa to meet with constituents and regret that I was not present to cast my vote on rollcall Nos. 630 and 631.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2584 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 363 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2584.

□ 1348

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMPBELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 2584, the fiscal year 2012 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

As we begin, I want to personally thank Mr. MORAN, Mr. DICKS, and each of the members of our subcommittee for their active participation in the bipartisan spirit that has been part of our deliberations this year. Regardless of our positions on this bill, I do sincerely appreciate their constructive contributions.

Mr. Chairman, we're living at a time when the Federal Government borrows more than 40 cents on each dollar that it spends. We are also living in a time of record deficits and debt. While reductions in discretionary spending alone will not totally erase the deficit, we all know that reducing Federal spending is a necessary first step.

The fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environment bill is funded at \$27.5 billion, which is \$2.1 billion, or 7 percent below the fiscal year enacted level, and \$3.8 billion, or 12 percent below the budget request.

Overall, funding within this bill is essentially level within fiscal year 2009 spending. The subcommittee has made some very difficult choices in preparing this budget proposal. In total, 235 Members of the House submitted over 1,700 programmatic requests to the subcommittee for consideration.

While the bill makes significant spending reductions across many agencies and programs, it also provides ample funding to address the needs of key accounts supported by a bipartisan cross-section of Members. For instance, fire suppression at the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service is fully funded at the 10-year average.

The bill includes a \$37 million increase over fiscal year 2011 for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to hire new inspectors and move forward with offshore oil and gas permitting and leasing while also improving safety. And Members will be pleased to know that the operations of our national parks are sustained at levels only slightly below last year, which means every park unit in the country will be operational and fully staffed without the threat of furloughs or layoffs.

Finally, this bill also makes critical investments in Indian Country. Building upon efforts initiated by Mr. DICKS and Mr. MORAN, this bill continues to make investments in human health and wellness programs in Indian Country, affecting health care, education, and self-determination. Overall, the Department of the Interior is funded at \$9.9 billion, which is a \$715 million, or 7 percent, reduction below last year's enacted level.

As I mentioned, we've done some things that Secretary Salazar will support. The Secretary and I have had many discussions about these issues as well as some areas where funding isn't what he would like to see. One of those areas relates to the funding of the Endangered Species Act.

Since the ESA was enacted, there have been 2,018 species listed and only 21 species recovered. By any calculation, that's a pretty poor track record. Any other program with such a poor rate of success would have long since been terminated. There isn't one member of this subcommittee opposed to recovering endangered species; but the ESA has become so contentious, so political, and so litigious that it has become a policy failure. The authoriza-

tion for the ESA appropriation expired 20 years ago, and the assumption has been that the Appropriations Committee would continue to fund it year in and year out, as it has in the past.

In fact, Members might be interested to know that 26 percent of the funding in this bill is for programs in which the authorizations have expired. That's not how the process is supposed to work, Mr. Chairman. And just as we are going back to regular order and passing appropriation bills, we need to return to regular order when it comes to working with the authorizers to update and fix laws that no longer work or have expired.

It's time to fix the ESA. The best way to do that is for the authorizers and stakeholders in the conservation community to come to the table to fix what is broken so we can actually begin recovering species. We are sending that message today.

Climate change is another item of interest to members of this committee. Most of the Members know that I am not a climate change naysayer. The fact is that climate change funding has been increasing over the past few years, and no one has any idea how or whether its funding is being coordinated between various agencies. The GAO came to the same conclusion in a report released in May of this year. The GAO said: "Without further improvement in how Federal climate change funding is defined and reported, strategic priorities are set, and funding is aligned with priorities, it will be difficult for the public and Congress to fully understand how climate change funds are accounted for and how they are spent." As a result of this ongoing concern, climate change funding in this bill is reduced by \$83 million, or 22 percent.

The bill also makes significant reductions in funding for land acquisition. Land acquisition was funded at \$301 million in the current fiscal year. The President had requested \$900 million for next year. We funded it at \$66 million in this bill to complete land acquisitions currently under consideration. I would personally like to see more funding in the LWCF. The problem is, we just don't have the money.

It's also worth noting that while we increase funding for oil and gas rig inspections, we don't pay for them by including the President's proposed \$38 million increase for additional onshore gas and oil fees or the \$55 million increase for additional offshore oil and gas fees. These issues are best left to the authorizing committees of jurisdiction. And I hope that by next year, the authorizing committees will address this issue.

There are a few other items that may be of interest to Members that I'll mention briefly: The U.S. Geological Survey is funded at \$1.1 billion, which is \$30 million, or 3 percent, below the FY11-enacted level. The next-generation Landsat satellite imaging program, which has been a cooperative

venture with NASA, was proposed to be transferred entirely to USGS without any corresponding funding from NASA. Because projected costs are estimated to increase tenfold over the next 2 years and because Landsat is a widely used governmental and private sector resource, this bill sends the proposal back to the administration with instructions to start over.

Within the EPA, the bill includes \$15 million for a new competitive grant program to fund rural water technical assistance, which is widely supported on both sides of the aisle. The NEA and the NEH are both funded at \$135 million, which is a level too low for some Members and too high for others. It's worth noting that both sides worked together in an effort to maintain several longstanding proven programs that the administration had slated for termination.

The bill provides funding for the Smithsonian at levels just below the FY11-enacted level and includes \$50 million to begin construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture and \$75 million for revitalization of existing Smithsonian buildings. The bill also provides a \$30 million down payment to begin construction next year of a memorial to honor the memory of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I suspect that most of the headlines from House consideration of this bill will focus on the committee's attention to the EPA. We need to continue funding the EPA in order for business to obtain the necessary permits to operate in accord with the environmental laws.

Through EPA funding, we also continue to address our Nation's critical water and wastewater infrastructure needs. However, one of the major underlying themes to this year's work is the sheer volume of regulatory actions being pursued by agencies in the absence of legislation and without clear congressional direction.

My intense opposition to the EPA's efforts to control nearly every industry in this country is no secret. The EPA's unrestrained effort to regulate greenhouse gases and the pursuit of an overly aggressive regulatory agenda are signs of an agency that has lost its bearings.

Wherever I go, the biggest complaint I hear about the Federal Government is about how the EPA is creating economic uncertainty and killing jobs. This isn't a partisan issue. Members of both parties have said that the EPA's regulatory actions vastly exceed its authority and congressional intent. The responsibility to determine whether or not to expand that authority rests solely with Congress, not with the EPA. We have included a number of provisions in the base bill to address some of these issues and more were added in full committee. We saw during consideration of H.R. 1 earlier this year and we will see again on the House floor even more efforts to rein in the EPA.

I know some of my Democrat friends will be especially critical of the spending reductions in EPA accounts. While we all recognize the importance of the clean drinking water and safe drinking water State revolving funds, we also know funding them, as we have in the past, is not possible. We need to find a better long-term funding source for water infrastructure projects, something that a number of Members have been working on.

It's also worth pointing out that these accounts received \$6 billion in Recovery Act funds in 2009 and still have nearly \$3 billion in previously appropriated funding that they have yet to spend. In calendar year 2009, the EPA received over \$25 billion in combined stimulus funding and regular appropriation. So it should come as no surprise that the funding for the EPA was reduced by \$1.5 billion, or 18 percent, from current levels.

Much will be said today about the subcommittee's allocation of the policy provisions in this bill; but just remember, at the end of the day, what this committee is attempting to do is all about reducing spending, creating more certainty in the marketplace, and promoting an economic environment conducive to job growth. If there's one

thing that we should have learned in the last couple of years, it's that we can't spend our way to an economic recovery. That didn't work. All it did was make the hole we're in much deeper.

I know Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS may not agree, but the legislative provisions in this bill and those that will be added today and on the House floor, they are not special interests. They're about jobs. They're about protecting businesses and hardworking Americans from frivolous lawsuits. They're about creating certainty in the marketplace, and they're about assuring businesses that employ people that it's safe to begin hiring people again without the threat of the EPA, under the guise of protecting our environment, imposing millions of dollars of penalties through regulations that are unreasonable or simply defy common sense.

Is this a perfect bill? No. But I've never seen a perfect bill. This is a bill that makes some very tough choices on spending. It's a bill that attempts to rein in the excesses of the EPA, and it's a bill that sends a clear message to stakeholders in Congress that it's time to get busy on renewing expiring authorizations. I wish we had more money to spend on a variety of programs that I, and other Members, be-

lieve are important. I also wish we didn't have a \$1.6 trillion deficit. I wish we weren't \$14.5 trillion in debt. I wish the economy was booming and that unemployment was something we only read about in history books. Unfortunately, wishing doesn't make it so. These are the economic and political realities that we have to face.

□ 1400

In closing, I'd like to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in producing this bill. Most Members don't realize how much time and effort staff members put into this. On the minority side, I'd like to thank Rick Healy and Shalanda Young, as well as Tim Aiken and Pete Modaff. They have played an integral role in the process, and their efforts are very much appreciated.

On the majority side, I'd like to thank the subcommittee staff: Colin Vickery, Grace Stephens, who, by the way, just had a baby last week—she held off until she was sure we had this bill through the full committee—Erica Rhoad, Jason Gray, Darren Benjamin, and Dave LesStrang. I'd also like to thank Missy Small, Kaylyn Bessey and Lindsay Slater on my personal staff for their great work.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of Lands and Resources					
Land Resources:					
Soil, water and air management.....	62,989	46,303	46,303	-16,686	---
Range management.....	76,915	71,603	87,532	+10,617	+15,929
Forestry management.....	9,945	9,730	9,945	---	+215
Riparian management.....	22,805	23,052	22,718	-87	-334
Cultural resources management.....	16,816	25,614	16,131	-685	-9,483
Wild horse and burro management.....	75,753	75,008	63,986	-11,767	-11,022
Subtotal.....	265,223	251,310	246,615	-18,608	-4,695
Wildlife and Fisheries:					
Wildlife management.....	37,430	36,973	37,430	---	+457
Fisheries management.....	13,599	13,354	13,354	-245	---
Subtotal.....	51,029	50,327	50,784	-245	+457
Threatened and endangered species.....	22,159	21,668	21,668	-491	---
Recreation Management:					
Wilderness management.....	19,664	19,587	18,421	-1,243	-1,166
Recreation resources management.....	49,153	57,170	49,153	---	-8,017
Subtotal.....	68,817	76,757	67,574	-1,243	-9,183
Energy and Minerals:					
Oil and gas.....	70,130	39,632	74,582	+4,452	+34,950
Oil and gas permit processing fund.....	45,500	32,500	32,500	-13,000	---
(Pilot offices, Sec. 365, permit processing fund)...	(21,000)	(20,973)	(20,973)	(-27)	---
Subtotal, Oil and gas/permit processing fund....	115,630	72,132	107,082	-8,548	+34,950
Oil and gas offsetting permit processing fees.....	-45,500	-32,500	-32,500	+13,000	---
Inspection fees.....	---	37,950	---	---	-37,950
Offsetting collections, inspection fees.....	---	-37,950	---	---	+37,950
Coal management.....	9,724	7,054	7,054	-2,670	---
Other mineral resources.....	10,597	8,415	10,415	-182	+2,000
Renewable energy.....	---	19,735	19,735	+19,735	---
Subtotal, Energy and minerals.....	90,451	74,836	111,786	+21,335	+36,950
Realty and Ownership Management:					
Alaska conveyance.....	29,108	16,622	16,622	-12,486	---
Cadastral survey.....	12,392	12,015	12,015	-377	---
Land and realty management.....	56,400	32,657	32,657	-23,743	---
Subtotal.....	97,900	61,294	61,294	-36,606	---
Resource Protection and Maintenance:					
Resource management planning.....	42,426	40,621	35,621	-6,805	-5,000
Abandoned mine lands.....	---	19,851	19,851	+19,851	---
Resource protection and law enforcement.....	27,685	27,067	27,067	-618	---
Hazardous materials management.....	17,028	16,668	16,668	-360	---
Subtotal.....	87,139	104,207	99,207	+12,068	-5,000
Transportation and Facilities Maintenance:					
Operations.....	6,047	---	---	-6,047	---
Annual maintenance.....	31,879	41,226	38,226	+6,347	-3,000
Deferred maintenance.....	34,429	30,008	30,008	-4,421	---
Subtotal.....	72,355	71,234	68,234	-4,121	-3,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land and resources information systems.....	16,697	15,852	15,852	-845	---
Workforce and Organizational Support:					
Information systems operations.....	15,343	14,697	14,697	-646	---
Administrative support.....	50,287	49,209	49,209	-1,078	---
Bureauwide fixed costs.....	91,307	93,576	91,307	---	-2,269
Subtotal.....	156,937	157,482	155,213	-1,724	-2,269
Challenge cost share.....	1,202	9,467	---	-1,202	-9,467
National landscape conservation system, base program..	31,870	39,345	20,000	-11,870	-19,345
(National landscape conservation system,total program)	(74,635)	---	---	(-74,635)	---
Subtotal, Management of lands and resources.....	961,779	933,779	918,227	-43,552	-15,552
Mining Law Administration:					
Administration.....	36,696	39,696	39,696	+3,000	---
Offsetting collections.....	-47,696	-54,000	-54,000	-6,304	---
Subtotal, Mining Law Administration.....	-11,000	-14,304	-14,304	-3,304	---
Total, Management of lands and resources.....	950,779	919,475	903,923	-46,856	-15,552
Construction					
Appropriation.....	4,617	3,576	3,576	-1,041	---
Land Acquisition					
Land Acquisition.....	18,584	46,620	---	-18,584	-46,620
Inholding, emergency, and hardship.....	1,497	1,500	3,000	+1,503	+1,500
Acquisition management.....	1,875	1,880	1,880	+5	---
Total, Land acquisition.....	21,956	50,000	4,880	-17,076	-45,120
Oregon and California Grant Lands					
Western Oregon resources management.....	96,929	98,056	98,056	+1,127	---
Western Oregon information and resource data systems..	2,124	1,926	1,926	-198	---
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	11,136	11,002	11,002	-134	---
Western Oregon construction and acquisition.....	314	310	310	-4	---
Western Oregon national monument.....	831	749	749	-82	---
Total, Oregon and California grant lands.....	111,334	112,043	112,043	+709	---
Range Improvements					
Improvements to public lands.....	7,873	7,873	7,873	---	---
Farm Tenant Act lands.....	1,527	1,527	1,527	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	600	600	600	---	---
Total, Range improvements.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures					
Rights-of-way processing.....	16,400	16,400	16,400	---	---
Energy and minerals cost recovery.....	2,600	7,300	7,300	+4,700	---
Recreation cost recovery.....	1,000	1,500	1,500	+500	---
Adopt-a-horse program.....	500	450	450	-50	---
Repair of damaged lands.....	5,600	3,100	3,100	-2,500	---
Cost recoverable realty cases.....	900	900	900	---	---
Timber purchaser expenses.....	100	50	50	-50	---
Commercial film and photography fees.....	200	200	200	---	---
Copy fees.....	2,000	1,100	1,100	-900	---
Trans Alaska pipeline.....	4,000	1,125	1,125	-2,875	---
Subtotal (gross).....	33,300	32,125	32,125	-1,175	---
Offsetting fees.....	-33,300	-32,125	-32,125	+1,175	---
Total, Service Charges, Deposits & Forfeitures..	---	---	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Miscellaneous Trust Funds and Permanent Operating Funds					
Current appropriations.....	15,200	19,700	19,700	+4,500	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.....	1,113,886	1,114,794	1,054,122	-59,764	-60,672
(Mandatory).....	(25,200)	(29,700)	(29,700)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary).....	(1,088,686)	(1,085,094)	(1,024,422)	(-64,264)	(-60,672)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Resource Management					
Ecological Services:					
Endangered species:					
Candidate conservation.....	11,448	11,426	10,670	-778	-756
Listing and critical habitat:					
Critical habitat.....	9,472	10,431	---	-9,472	-10,431
Listing.....	11,430	8,847	---	-11,430	-8,847
International listing.....	---	1,500	---	---	-1,500
Petitions.....	---	3,866	---	---	-3,866
Subtotal.....	20,902	24,644	---	-20,902	-24,644
Consultation and HCPs.....	61,877	62,888	53,462	-8,415	-9,426
Recovery.....	81,219	83,692	74,575	-6,644	-9,117
Subtotal, Endangered species.....	175,446	182,650	138,707	-36,739	-43,943
Habitat conservation:					
Partners for fish and wildlife.....	55,304	59,400	39,400	-15,904	-20,000
Conservation planning assistance.....	36,791	38,368	21,368	-15,423	-17,000
Coastal programs.....	15,137	15,436	13,436	-1,701	-2,000
National wetlands inventory.....	5,292	5,238	4,238	-1,054	-1,000
Subtotal, Habitat conservation.....	112,524	118,442	78,442	-34,082	-40,000
Environmental contaminants.....	13,316	13,825	11,825	-1,491	-2,000
Subtotal, Ecological services.....	301,286	314,917	228,974	-72,312	-85,943
National Wildlife Refuge System:					
Wildlife and habitat management.....	226,963	240,241	199,859	-27,104	-40,382
Visitor services.....	75,631	77,621	72,906	-2,725	-4,715
Refuge law enforcement.....	38,071	37,558	31,637	-6,434	-5,921
Conservation planning.....	11,862	8,283	11,723	-139	+3,440
Refuge maintenance.....	139,532	139,172	139,172	-360	---
Subtotal.....	492,059	502,875	455,297	-36,762	-47,578
Migratory Birds, Law Enforcement & International Conservation:					
Migratory bird management.....	52,175	54,423	50,423	-1,752	-4,000
Law enforcement.....	62,930	62,634	58,634	-4,296	-4,000
International affairs.....	13,119	12,991	12,991	-128	---
Subtotal.....	128,224	130,048	122,048	-6,176	-8,000
Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Conservation:					
National fish hatchery system operations.....	48,856	42,761	46,149	-2,707	+3,388
Maintenance and equipment.....	18,180	18,060	18,060	-120	---
Aquatic habitat and species conservation.....	71,903	75,191	64,134	-7,769	-11,057
Subtotal.....	138,939	136,012	128,343	-10,596	-7,669

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Cooperative landscape conservation & adaptive science:					
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	14,727	20,247	10,000	-4,727	-10,247
Adaptive science.....	16,243	17,236	10,000	-6,243	-7,236
Subtotal.....	30,970	37,483	20,000	-10,970	-17,483
General Operations:					
Central office operations.....	42,720	39,941	38,777	-3,943	-1,164
Regional office operations.....	42,836	42,299	41,480	-1,356	-819
Servicewide bill paying.....	36,360	36,097	32,941	-3,419	-3,156
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.....	7,537	8,537	7,537	---	-1,000
National Conservation Training Center.....	23,930	23,658	23,658	-272	---
Subtotal.....	153,383	150,532	144,393	-8,990	-6,139
Total, Resource Management.....	1,244,861	1,271,867	1,099,055	-145,806	-172,812
Construction					
Construction and rehabilitation:					
Line item construction projects.....	9,810	12,149	2,365	-7,445	-9,784
Bridge and dam safety programs.....	1,851	1,855	1,855	+4	---
Nationwide engineering service.....	9,143	9,084	7,584	-1,559	-1,500
Total, Construction.....	20,804	23,088	11,804	-9,000	-11,284
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions.....	35,374	108,990	---	-35,374	-108,990
Highlands Conservation Act.....	---	5,000	4,000	+4,000	-1,000
Inholdings/emergencies and hardships.....	4,990	5,000	3,000	-1,990	-2,000
Exchanges.....	1,996	2,000	---	-1,996	-2,000
Acquisition management.....	10,534	13,570	6,570	-3,964	-7,000
User pay cost share.....	1,996	2,000	1,477	-519	-523
Refuge land protection planning.....	---	3,440	---	---	-3,440
Total, Land acquisition.....	54,890	140,000	15,047	-39,843	-124,953
Landowner Incentive Program					
Rescission of prior year balances.....	-4,941	---	---	+4,941	---
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund					
Grants and administration:					
Conservation grants.....	11,101	17,000	---	-11,101	-17,000
HCP assistance grants.....	10,000	13,500	---	-10,000	-13,500
Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004.....	4,987	---	---	-4,987	---
Administration.....	2,854	3,354	2,854	---	-500
Subtotal, Grants and administration.....	28,942	33,854	2,854	-26,088	-31,000
Land acquisition:					
Species recovery land acquisition.....	11,000	19,646	---	-11,000	-19,646
HCP land acquisition grants to states.....	19,938	46,500	---	-19,938	-46,500
Subtotal, Land acquisition.....	30,938	66,146	---	-30,938	-66,146
Total, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund.....	59,880	100,000	2,854	-57,026	-97,146
National Wildlife Refuge Fund					
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	14,471	---	13,980	-491	+13,980

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund					
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund.....	37,425	50,000	20,000	-17,425	-30,000
Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund					
Migratory bird grants.....	3,992	5,000	---	-3,992	-5,000
Multinational Species Conservation Fund					
African elephant conservation fund.....	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund.....	2,604	2,450	1,969	-635	-481
Asian elephant conservation fund.....	1,735	1,950	1,477	-258	-473
Great ape conservation fund.....	2,170	1,950	1,969	-201	+19
Marine turtle conservation fund.....	1,736	1,450	983	-753	-467
Total, Multinational Species Conservation Fund..	9,980	9,750	7,875	-2,105	-1,875
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants					
State wildlife grants (formula).....	49,900	67,000	20,000	-29,900	-47,000
State wildlife grants (competitive).....	4,990	20,000	---	-4,990	-20,000
Tribal wildlife grants.....	6,986	8,000	2,000	-4,986	-6,000
Total, State and tribal wildlife grants.....	61,876	95,000	22,000	-39,876	-73,000
TOTAL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.....	1,503,238	1,694,705	1,192,615	-310,623	-502,090
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Operation of the National Park System					
Park Management:					
Resource stewardship.....	343,640	356,276	336,742	-6,898	-19,534
Visitor services.....	239,817	251,299	240,817	+1,000	-10,482
Park protection.....	362,143	364,895	362,143	---	-2,752
Facility operations and maintenance.....	695,020	706,538	691,020	-4,000	-15,518
Park support.....	442,967	448,679	442,967	---	-5,712
Subtotal.....	2,083,587	2,127,687	2,073,689	-9,898	-53,998
External administrative costs.....	166,463	169,190	166,463	---	-2,727
Total, Operation of the National Park System....	2,250,050	2,296,877	2,240,152	-9,898	-56,725
National Recreation and Preservation					
Recreation programs.....	587	585	585	-2	---
Natural programs.....	11,172	13,376	11,172	---	-2,204
Cultural programs.....	24,882	24,804	24,804	-78	---
International park affairs.....	1,646	1,638	1,638	-8	---
Environmental and compliance review.....	433	431	431	-2	---
Grant administration.....	1,749	1,740	1,740	-9	---
Heritage Partnership Programs.....	17,401	8,993	8,993	-8,408	---
Total, National Recreation and Preservation.....	57,870	51,567	49,363	-8,507	-2,204
Historic Preservation Fund					
State historic preservation offices.....	46,407	50,000	42,500	-3,907	-7,500
Tribal grants.....	7,984	11,000	7,000	-984	-4,000
Total, Historic Preservation Fund.....	54,391	61,000	49,500	-4,891	-11,500

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Construction					
General Program:					
Line item construction and maintenance.....	121,159	70,347	70,347	-50,812	---
Emergency and unscheduled.....	3,853	3,861	3,861	+8	---
Housing.....	4,955	2,965	2,965	-1,990	---
Dam safety.....	2,495	1,250	1,250	-1,245	---
Equipment replacement.....	13,723	13,750	13,750	+27	---
Planning, construction.....	10,104	7,712	7,712	-2,392	---
Construction program management.....	38,527	37,590	37,590	-937	---
General management plans.....	14,830	14,646	14,646	-184	---
Rescission of prior year balances.....	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
Total, Construction.....	184,646	152,121	152,121	-32,525	---
Land and Water Conservation Fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land Acquisition and State Assistance					
Assistance to States:					
State conservation grants (formula).....	37,126	78,000	---	-37,126	-78,000
State conservation grants (competitive).....	---	117,000	---	---	-117,000
Administrative expenses.....	2,794	5,000	2,794	---	-2,206
Subtotal.....	39,920	200,000	2,794	-37,126	-197,206
National Park Service:					
Acquisitions.....	32,767	109,000	---	-32,767	-109,000
American Battlefield Protection Program.....	8,982	10,000	2,000	-6,982	-8,000
Emergencies and hardships.....	1,007	12,000	1,250	+243	-10,750
Acquisition management.....	7,134	12,000	7,250	+116	-4,750
Inholdings, donations, and exchanges.....	5,000	17,000	5,000	---	-12,000
Subtotal.....	54,890	160,000	15,500	-39,390	-144,500
Total, Land Acquisition and State Assistance....	94,810	360,000	18,294	-76,516	-341,706
Rescission.....	-625	---	---	+625	---
TOTAL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.....	2,611,142	2,891,565	2,479,430	-131,712	-412,135
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, Investigations, and Research					
Ecosystems:					
Status and trends.....	22,403	22,079	20,985	-1,418	-1,094
Fisheries: Aquatic and endangered resources.....	23,694	22,660	22,660	-1,034	---
Wildlife: Terrestrial and endangered resources.....	49,078	48,544	44,230	-4,848	-4,314
Terrestrial, Freshwater and marine environments....	35,763	40,230	37,227	+1,464	-3,003
Invasive species.....	10,795	14,086	10,580	-215	-3,506
Cooperative research units.....	19,104	18,824	14,438	-4,666	-4,386
Total, Ecosystems.....	160,837	166,423	150,120	-10,717	-16,303
Climate and Land Use Change:					
Climate variability:					
Climate science centers.....	20,921	25,573	25,573	+4,652	---
Research and development.....	28,468	24,141	15,055	-13,413	-9,086
Carbon sequestration.....	9,955	14,345	---	-9,955	-14,345
Science support for DOI bureaus.....	4,990	8,860	---	-4,990	-8,860
Subtotal.....	64,334	72,919	40,628	-23,706	-32,291

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Use Change:					
Land remote sensing.....	62,387	21,975	73,792	+11,405	+51,817
Geographic analysis and monitoring.....	11,420	11,511	11,511	+91	---
Subtotal.....	73,807	33,486	85,303	+11,496	+51,817
Total, Climate and Land Use Change.....	138,141	106,405	125,931	-12,210	+19,526
Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health:					
Minerals resources.....	52,168	44,164	52,168	---	+8,004
Energy resources.....	27,750	27,392	27,750	---	+358
Contaminant biology.....	9,216	8,695	9,216	---	+521
Toxic substances hydrology.....	10,778	8,267	10,778	---	+2,511
Total, Energy, Minerals, and Env Health.....	99,912	88,518	99,912	---	+11,394
Natural Hazards:					
Earthquake hazards.....	55,979	52,326	55,979	---	+3,653
Volcano hazards.....	24,464	23,359	24,464	---	+1,105
Landslide hazards.....	3,318	3,278	3,318	---	+40
Global seismographic network.....	5,379	5,332	5,379	---	+47
Geomagnetism.....	2,097	2,073	2,097	---	+24
Coastal and marine geology.....	44,728	47,501	44,728	---	-2,773
Total, Natural Hazards.....	135,965	133,869	135,965	---	+2,096
Water Resources:					
Groundwater resources.....	8,481	6,947	8,481	---	+1,534
National water quality assessment.....	64,234	57,540	64,234	---	+6,694
National streamflow information program.....	27,100	26,913	30,000	+2,900	+3,087
Hydrologic research and development.....	11,932	12,008	12,008	+76	---
Hydrologic networks and analysis.....	30,719	33,940	30,719	---	-3,221
Cooperative Water Program.....	63,471	62,252	65,561	+2,090	+3,309
Water Resources Research Act Program.....	6,486	---	6,500	+14	+6,500
Total, Water Resources.....	212,423	199,600	217,503	+5,080	+17,903
Core Science Systems:					
Biological information management and delivery.....	18,563	15,113	15,113	-3,450	---
Nat'l Geological & Geophysical Data Pres Program....	998	---	600	-398	+600
National cooperative geological mapping.....	27,712	25,397	27,712	---	+2,315
National Geospatial Program.....	65,755	65,365	65,755	---	+390
Total, Core Science Systems.....	113,028	105,875	109,180	-3,848	+3,305
Administration and Enterprise Information:					
Science support.....	77,229	79,620	77,229	---	-2,391
Security and technology.....	23,430	21,072	21,072	-2,358	---
Information resources.....	17,988	15,863	15,863	-2,125	---
Total, Admin and Enterprise Information.....	118,647	116,555	114,164	-4,483	-2,391
Facilities:					
Rental payments and operations & maintenance.....	97,427	93,485	93,485	-3,942	---
Deferred maintenance and capital improvement.....	7,292	4,807	7,292	---	+2,485
Construction.....	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500
Total, Facilities.....	104,719	100,792	100,777	-3,942	-15
Total, Surveys, Investigations, and Research....	1,083,672	1,018,037	1,053,552	-30,120	+35,515
National Land Imaging					
National land imaging.....	---	99,817	---	---	-99,817
TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.....	1,083,672	1,117,854	1,053,552	-30,120	-64,302

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT					
(Formerly the Minerals Management Service)					
Ocean Energy Management					
Offshore Energy and Minerals Management:					
Renewable energy.....	23,192	23,073	21,413	-1,779	-1,660
Leasing and environmental program.....	65,352	75,410	75,410	+10,058	---
Resource evaluation.....	35,057	34,733	34,733	-324	---
Regulatory program.....	88,368	143,319	110,319	+21,951	-33,000
Information management program.....	20,484	20,468	20,468	-16	---
Subtotal.....	232,453	297,003	262,343	+29,890	-34,660
Royalty Management:*					
Compliance and asset management.....	67,559	---	---	-67,559	---
Revenue and operations.....	41,805	---	---	-41,805	---
Subtotal.....	109,364	---	---	-109,364	---
*now ONRR under Office of the Secretary					
General Administration:					
Executive direction.....	5,751	3,040	3,040	-2,711	---
Policy and management improvement.....	5,441	10,039	10,039	+4,598	---
Administrative operations.....	21,215	12,324	12,324	-8,891	---
General support services.....	29,665	21,022	21,022	-8,643	---
Subtotal.....	62,072	46,425	46,425	-15,647	---
Total (gross).....	403,889	343,428	308,768	-95,121	-34,660
Use of receipts and cost recovery fees.....	-154,890	-160,163	-160,163	-5,273	---
Inspection fees.....	-10,000	-62,000	-10,000	---	+52,000
Total, Ocean Energy Management.....	238,999	121,265	138,605	-100,394	+17,340
Oil Spill Research					
Oil spill research.....	11,744	14,923	14,923	+3,179	---
Subtotal, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement.....	250,743	136,188	153,528	-97,215	+17,340
OCS Connect (rescission)(Sec. 128, P.L. 111-242).....	-25,000	---	---	+25,000	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION, AND ENFORCEMENT.....	225,743	136,188	153,528	-72,215	+17,340
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT					
Regulation and Technology					
Environmental restoration.....	161	---	---	-161	---
Environmental protection.....	94,578	87,438	92,019	-2,559	+4,581
Technology development and transfer.....	15,455	14,478	14,478	-977	---
Financial management.....	513	506	506	-7	---
Executive direction.....	16,219	15,947	15,947	-272	---
Civil penalties.....	100	100	100	---	---
Total, Regulation and Technology.....	127,026	118,469	123,050	-3,976	+4,581

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund					
Environmental restoration.....	15,015	9,495	9,495	-5,520	---
Technology development and transfer.....	5,751	3,550	3,550	-2,201	---
Financial management.....	6,443	6,406	6,406	-37	---
Executive direction.....	8,308	7,992	7,992	-316	---
Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.....	35,517	27,443	27,443	-8,074	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT.....					
	162,543	145,912	150,493	-12,050	+4,581
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Government:					
Aid to tribal government.....	31,886	30,541	30,541	-1,345	---
Consolidated tribal government program.....	71,710	76,520	71,710	---	-4,810
Self governance compacts.....	148,951	155,084	148,951	---	-6,133
Contract support.....	219,560	195,490	228,000	+8,440	+32,510
Indian self determination fund.....	1,996	2,000	2,000	+4	---
New tribes.....	310	315	315	+5	---
Small and needy tribes.....	---	2,950	2,950	+2,950	---
Road maintenance.....	26,390	25,431	25,431	-959	---
Tribal government program oversight.....	8,786	8,762	8,762	-24	---
Subtotal.....	509,589	497,093	518,660	+9,071	+21,567
Human Services:					
Social services.....	33,879	35,627	33,879	---	-1,748
Welfare assistance.....	74,761	74,911	74,911	+150	---
Indian child welfare act.....	11,053	10,867	10,867	-186	---
Housing improvement program.....	12,598	12,619	12,619	+21	---
Human services tribal design.....	430	430	430	---	---
Human services program oversight.....	3,900	3,373	3,373	-527	---
Subtotal.....	136,621	137,827	136,079	-542	-1,748
Trust - Natural Resources Management:					
Natural resources, general.....	4,547	5,124	5,124	+577	---
Irrigation operations and maintenance.....	11,910	11,939	11,939	+29	---
Rights protection implementation.....	28,442	29,602	29,602	+1,160	---
Tribal management/development program.....	6,782	8,651	6,782	---	-1,869
Endangered species.....	1,248	1,247	1,247	-1	---
Integrated resource information program.....	2,105	2,109	2,109	+4	---
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	419	200	419	---	+219
Agriculture and range.....	28,863	28,883	28,883	+20	---
Forestry.....	43,644	44,195	43,644	---	-551
Water resources.....	10,150	10,839	10,150	---	-689
Fish, wildlife and parks.....	11,340	13,342	11,341	+1	-2,001
Resource management program oversight.....	6,632	6,121	6,121	-511	---
Subtotal.....	156,082	162,252	157,361	+1,279	-4,891
Trust - Real Estate Services.....	145,821	125,457	122,596	-23,225	-2,861
Education:					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded)..	520,048	526,117	520,048	---	-6,069
(Tribal grant support costs)	(46,280)	(46,373)	(46,373)	(+93)	---
Post secondary programs (forward funded).....	64,192	64,321	64,321	+129	---
Subtotal, forward funded education.....	584,240	590,438	584,369	+129	-6,069
Elementary and secondary programs.....	76,939	122,730	102,730	+25,791	-20,000
Post secondary programs.....	61,603	60,380	60,380	-1,223	---
Education management.....	29,916	22,006	22,006	-7,910	---
Subtotal, Education.....	752,698	795,554	769,485	+16,787	-26,069

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Public Safety and Justice:					
Law enforcement.....	305,893	330,391	318,391	+12,498	-12,000
Tribal courts.....	27,088	23,445	23,445	-3,643	---
Fire protection.....	1,109	873	873	-236	---
Subtotal.....	334,090	354,709	342,709	+8,619	-12,000
Community and economic development.....	36,856	34,865	34,865	-1,991	---
Executive direction and administrative services.....	258,089	251,935	251,935	-6,154	---
(housing improvement, road maint, etc. in bill lang).. Total, Operation of Indian Programs.....	(59,545) 2,329,846	(48,049) 2,359,692	(48,049) 2,333,690	(-11,496) +3,844	--- -26,002
Construction					
Education.....	140,509	52,104	102,104	-38,405	+50,000
Public safety and justice.....	17,864	11,329	11,329	-6,535	---
Resources management.....	42,075	33,012	33,012	-9,063	---
General administration.....	2,039	2,035	2,035	-4	---
Construction management.....	7,093	6,512	6,512	-581	---
Total, Construction.....	209,580	104,992	154,992	-54,588	+50,000
Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians					
White Earth Land Settlement Act (Admin).....	624	625	625	+1	---
Hoopa-Yurok settlement fund.....	250	250	250	---	---
Pyramid Lake water rights settlement.....	142	142	142	---	---
Nez Perce/Snake River.....	15,432	9,450	9,450	-5,982	---
Navajo Water Resources Development Trust Fund.....	5,988	6,000	6,000	+12	---
Navajo Gallup Water Settlement.....	---	4,388	4,388	+4,388	---
Duck Valley Water Rights Settlement.....	11,976	12,000	12,000	+24	---
Puget Sound regional shellfish settlement.....	6,487	---	---	-6,487	---
Soboba Band/Luiseno Indian Settlement.....	5,488	---	---	-5,488	---
Total, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians.....	46,387	32,855	32,855	-13,532	---
Indian Guaranteed Loan Program Account					
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	8,199	3,114	8,114	-85	+5,000
TOTAL, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.....	2,594,012	2,500,653	2,529,651	-64,361	+28,998
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES					
Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses					
Executive direction.....	18,210	---	---	-18,210	---
Policy, management and budget.....	36,663	---	---	-36,663	---
Hearings and appeals.....	7,151	---	---	-7,151	---
Central administrative services.....	41,586	---	---	-41,586	---
Bureau of Mines workers compensation.....	570	---	---	-570	---
Indian Arts and Crafts Board.....	1,308	---	---	-1,308	---
Consolidated Appraisal services.....	12,112	---	---	-12,112	---
National Museum of American Latino Commission.....	998	---	---	-998	---
Leadership and administration.....	---	129,418	119,032	+119,032	-10,386
Management services.....	---	34,643	21,755	+21,755	-12,888
Office of Natural Resources Revenue.....	---	119,609	109,364	+109,364	-10,245
Total, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and expenses.....	118,598	283,670	250,151	+131,553	-33,519

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories					
Territorial Assistance					
Office of Insular Affairs.....	9,262	9,480	9,262	---	-218
Technical assistance.....	15,271	13,804	13,804	-1,467	---
Maintenance assistance fund.....	2,443	2,241	2,241	-202	---
Brown tree snake.....	2,994	3,000	2,994	---	-6
Coral reef initiative.....	998	1,000	998	---	-2
Water and wastewater projects.....	791	---	791	---	+791
Empowering Insular Communities.....	1,996	4,120	1,996	---	-2,124
Subtotal, Territorial Assistance.....	33,755	33,645	32,086	-1,669	-1,559
American Samoa operations grants.....	22,707	22,752	22,752	+45	---
Northern Marianas covenant grants.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Total, Assistance to Territories.....	84,182	84,117	82,558	-1,624	-1,559
Compact of Free Association					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services.....	2,808	2,818	2,808	---	-10
Discretionary payments - program grant assistance.....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
Enewetak support.....	499	236	499	---	+263
Compact payments, Palau (section 122).....	12,000	---	---	-12,000	---
Total, Compact of Free Association.....	17,307	3,054	3,307	-14,000	+253
Total, Insular Affairs.....	101,489	87,171	85,865	-15,624	-1,306
Office of the Solicitor					
Legal services.....	47,510	49,481	47,510	---	-1,971
General administration.....	16,244	16,385	16,244	---	-141
Ethics.....	1,192	2,610	1,192	---	-1,418
Total, Office of the Solicitor.....	64,946	68,476	64,946	---	-3,530
Office of Inspector General					
Audit and investigations.....	38,800	39,203	38,800	---	-403
Administrative services and information management....	9,693	10,268	9,693	---	-575
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	48,493	49,471	48,493	---	-978
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal Trust Programs					
Program operations, support, and improvements.....	157,942	150,103	150,103	-7,839	---
(Office of Historical Accounting).....	(31,534)	(31,171)	(31,171)	(-363)	---
Executive direction.....	2,736	2,216	2,216	-520	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....	160,678	152,319	152,319	-8,359	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES.....	494,204	641,107	601,774	+107,570	-39,333
(Mandatory).....	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
(Discretionary).....	(466,484)	(613,387)	(574,054)	(+107,570)	(-39,333)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS					
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire Operations:					
Preparedness.....	290,452	276,964	276,964	-13,488	---
Fire suppression operations.....	398,951	270,611	270,611	-128,340	---
Subtotal, Fire operations.....	689,403	547,575	547,575	-141,828	---
Other Operations:					
Hazardous fuels reduction.....	183,314	156,763	183,314	---	+26,551
Burned area rehabilitation.....	33,203	13,046	13,046	-20,157	---
Fire facilities.....	6,137	6,137	6,137	---	---
Joint fire science.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	---	---
Rural fire assistance.....	---	---	7,000	+7,000	+7,000
Subtotal, Other operations.....	228,654	181,946	215,497	-13,157	+33,551
Subtotal, Wildland fire management.....	918,057	729,521	763,072	-154,985	+33,551
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Use of emergency suppression funds.....	---	---	-189,000	-189,000	-189,000
Total, Wildland fire management.....	718,057	729,521	574,072	-143,985	-155,449
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account.....	60,878	92,000	92,000	+31,122	---
Total, all wildland fire accounts.....	778,935	821,521	666,072	-112,863	-155,449
Central Hazardous Materials Fund					
Central hazardous materials fund.....	10,155	10,149	10,149	-6	---
Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund					
Damage assessments.....	3,896	3,743	3,743	-153	---
Program management.....	1,937	1,906	1,406	-531	-500
Restoration support.....	616	614	614	-2	---
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund..	6,449	6,263	5,763	-686	-500
Working Capital Fund.....	85,651	73,119	57,019	-28,632	-16,100
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS.....	881,190	911,052	739,003	-142,187	-172,049
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
State royalty administrative cost deduction (BOEMRE).. (net receipt sharing - both on and offshore)	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
Geothermal Energy Receipts (Sec. 423).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Geothermal receipts amendment (P.L. 111-212).....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
TOTAL, GENERAL PROVISIONS.....	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	---	---
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR....	10,627,630	11,111,830	9,912,168	-715,462	-1,199,662
Appropriations.....	(10,913,196)	(11,141,830)	(9,942,168)	(-971,028)	(-1,199,662)
Rescissions.....	(-285,566)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+255,566)	---
(Mandatory).....	(52,920)	(57,420)	(57,420)	(+4,500)	---
(Discretionary).....	(10,574,710)	(11,054,410)	(9,854,748)	(-719,962)	(-1,199,662)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Science and Technology					
Air toxics and quality.....	120,517	---	---	-120,517	---
Clean Air and Climate.....	---	134,370	120,082	+120,082	-14,288
(Climate protection program).....	---	(16,345)	(16,345)	(+16,345)	---
Climate protection program.....	16,828	---	---	-16,828	---
Enforcement.....	15,293	15,326	15,293	---	-33
Homeland security.....	46,176	42,036	42,036	-4,140	---
Indoor air and Radiation.....	1,264	6,758	6,758	+5,494	---
IT / Data management / Security.....	3,657	4,108	3,657	---	-451
Operations and administration.....	69,660	76,521	70,050	+390	-6,471
(Rent).....	(30,237)	(35,661)	(35,661)	(+5,424)	---
(Utilities).....	(19,851)	(20,195)	(20,195)	(+344)	---
(Security).....	(10,327)	(10,714)	(10,714)	(+387)	---
Pesticide licensing.....	6,578	6,831	6,578	---	-253
Research: Air, climate and energy.....	---	108,000	93,000	+93,000	-15,000
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability.....	---	138,057	125,514	+125,514	-12,543
(Research: Computational toxicology).....	(21,054)	(21,211)	(21,054)	---	(-157)
(Research: Endocrine disruptor).....	(15,950)	(16,888)	(15,950)	---	(-938)
Research: Clean air.....	102,404	---	---	-102,404	---
Research: Human health and ecosystems.....	243,894	---	---	-243,894	---
Research: Land protection.....	13,372	---	---	-13,372	---
Research: National priorities.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Research: Pesticides and toxics.....	27,285	---	---	-27,285	---
Research: Safe and sustainable water resources.....	117,297	118,776	108,532	-8,765	-10,244
Research: Sustainable and healthy communities.....	---	171,026	154,324	+154,324	-16,702
Research: Sustainability.....	25,486	---	---	-25,486	---
Water: Human health protection.....	3,769	3,787	3,787	+18	---
Total, Science and Technology.....	813,480	825,596	754,611	-58,869	-70,985
(transfer from Superfund).....	(26,780)	(23,016)	(23,016)	(-3,764)	---
Environmental Programs and Management					
Air toxics and quality.....	207,272	---	---	-207,272	---
Brownfields.....	23,680	26,397	23,680	---	-2,717
Clean air and climate.....	---	315,286	263,741	+263,741	-51,545
(Climate protection program).....	---	(111,419)	(91,997)	(+91,997)	(-19,422)
Climate protection program.....	107,530	---	---	-107,530	---
Compliance.....	106,874	119,648	106,874	---	-12,774
Enforcement.....	255,850	268,218	226,656	-29,194	-41,562
(Environmental justice).....	(6,856)	(7,397)	(6,856)	---	(-541)
Environmental protection: National priorities.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Geographic programs:					
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.....	299,400	350,000	250,000	-49,400	-100,000
Chesapeake Bay.....	54,391	67,350	50,000	-4,391	-17,350
San Francisco Bay.....	5,333	4,847	4,847	-486	---
Puget Sound.....	38,095	19,289	30,000	-8,095	+10,711
Long Island Sound.....	5,333	2,962	2,962	-2,371	---
Gulf of Mexico.....	4,572	4,464	4,464	-108	---
South Florida.....	1,653	2,061	1,653	---	-408
Upper Mississippi River Basin.....	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000
Lake Champlain.....	3,048	1,399	1,399	-1,649	---
Lake Pontchartrain.....	1,143	955	955	-188	---
CARE(Community Action for a Renewed Environment)....	1,865	2,384	---	-1,865	-2,384
Other geographic activities.....	1,209	1,296	---	-1,209	-1,296
Subtotal.....	416,042	463,007	346,280	-69,762	-116,727

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Homeland security.....	12,856	11,300	11,300	-1,556	---
Indoor air and radiation.....	25,887	33,770	33,770	+7,883	---
Information exchange / Outreach.....	133,979	145,210	120,936	-13,043	-24,274
(Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination).....	(7,491)	(10,795)	(6,515)	(-976)	(-4,280)
(Environmental education).....	(9,713)	(9,885)	---	(-9,713)	(-9,885)
International programs.....	19,068	19,447	16,195	-2,873	-3,252
IT / Data management / Security.....	99,549	95,413	93,372	-6,177	-2,041
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	122,657	128,610	89,234	-33,423	-39,376
Operations and administration.....	496,017	507,535	476,419	-19,598	-31,116
(Rent).....	(162,578)	(170,807)	(170,807)	(+8,229)	---
(Utilities).....	(13,182)	(11,221)	(11,221)	(-1,961)	---
(Security).....	(30,836)	(29,266)	(29,266)	(-1,570)	---
Pesticide licensing.....	116,889	110,523	110,523	-6,366	---
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).....	118,043	116,871	112,643	-5,400	-4,228
Toxics risk review and prevention.....	100,123	115,297	100,123	---	-15,174
(Endocrine disruptors).....	(8,554)	(8,268)	(8,268)	(-286)	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	12,966	12,866	12,866	-100	---
Water: Ecosystems					
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	26,748	27,058	26,748	---	-310
Wetlands.....	26,505	27,368	21,199	-5,306	-6,169
Subtotal.....	53,253	54,426	47,947	-5,306	-6,479
Water: Human health protection.....	104,188	107,324	98,324	-5,864	-9,000
Water quality protection.....	223,747	225,486	192,550	-31,197	-32,936
Total, Environmental Programs and Management....	2,756,470	2,876,634	2,498,433	-258,037	-378,201
Office of Inspector General					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	44,701	45,997	41,099	-3,602	-4,898
(transfer from Superfund).....	(9,955)	(10,009)	(9,955)	---	(-54)
Buildings and Facilities					
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure.....	7,055	8,038	7,055	---	-983
Operations and administration.....	29,373	33,931	29,373	---	-4,558
Total, Buildings and Facilities.....	36,428	41,969	36,428	---	-5,541
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	9,955	10,009	9,955	---	-54
Compliance.....	1,234	1,222	1,222	-12	---
Enforcement.....	191,621	191,615	181,615	-10,006	-10,000
Homeland security.....	41,707	41,834	41,834	+127	---
Indoor air and radiation.....	2,454	2,487	2,454	---	-33
Information exchange / Outreach.....	1,431	1,433	1,433	+2	---
IT /data management/security.....	17,408	16,080	16,080	-1,328	---
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	1,528	1,677	1,528	---	-149
Operations and administration.....	136,648	138,069	136,369	-279	-1,700
(Rent).....	(43,798)	(47,112)	(47,112)	(+3,314)	---
(Utilities).....	(3,741)	(3,765)	(3,765)	(+24)	---
(Security).....	(8,396)	(8,282)	(8,282)	(-114)	---
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability*.....	4,027	3,342	3,342	-685	---
Research: Sustainable communities**.....	20,546	17,706	17,706	-2,840	---
Research: Sustainability.....	95	---	---	-95	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Superfund cleanup:					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	200,498	194,895	194,895	-5,603	---
Superfund: Emergency preparedness.....	9,345	9,263	9,263	-82	---
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	31,135	26,242	26,242	-4,893	---
Superfund: Remedial.....	605,368	574,499	574,499	-30,869	---
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies.....	5,908	5,858	5,858	-50	---
Subtotal.....	852,254	810,757	810,757	-41,497	---
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,280,908	1,236,231	1,224,295	-56,613	-11,936
(transfer to Inspector General).....	(-9,955)	(-10,009)	(-9,955)	---	(+54)
(transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-26,780)	(-23,016)	(-23,016)	(+3,764)	---
* Formerly Research: Human health and ecosystems					
** Formerly Research: Land protection					
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST)					
Enforcement.....	789	832	789	---	-43
Operations and administration.....	1,854	1,591	1,591	-263	---
Research: Sustainable communities*.....	397	454	454	+57	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	109,835	109,604	102,835	-7,000	-6,769
(LUST/UST).....	(12,410)	(11,982)	(11,982)	(-428)	---
(LUST cooperative agreements).....	(63,066)	(63,192)	(56,423)	(-6,643)	(-6,769)
(Energy Policy Act grants).....	(34,359)	(34,430)	(34,430)	(+71)	---
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.....	112,875	112,481	105,669	-7,206	-6,812
* Formerly Research: Land protection					
Inland Oil Spill Program (formerly Oil Spill Response)					
Compliance.....	135	138	138	+3	---
Enforcement.....	2,288	2,902	2,288	---	-614
Oil.....	14,698	19,472	14,698	---	-4,774
Operations and administration.....	537	536	536	-1	---
Research: Sustainable communities*.....	684	614	614	-70	---
Total, Inland Oil Spill Program.....	18,342	23,662	18,274	-68	-5,388
* Formerly Research: Land protection					
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Alaska Native villages.....	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Brownfields projects.....	99,800	99,041	60,000	-39,800	-39,041
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	1,521,950	1,550,000	689,000	-832,950	-861,000
Diesel emissions grants.....	49,900	---	30,000	-19,900	+30,000
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	963,070	990,000	829,000	-134,070	-161,000
Mexico border.....	9,980	10,000	---	-9,980	-10,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance grants.....	2,654,680	2,659,041	1,608,000	-1,046,680	-1,051,041
Categorical grants:					
Beaches protection.....	9,880	9,900	9,880	---	-20
Brownfields.....	49,396	49,495	49,396	---	-99
Environmental information.....	9,980	10,200	9,980	---	-220
Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	103,139	103,412	103,139	---	-273
Lead.....	14,535	14,855	14,535	---	-320
Multi-media tribal implementation.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	175,505	164,757	150,505	-25,000	-14,252
Pesticides enforcement.....	18,674	19,085	18,674	---	-411
Pesticides program implementation.....	13,493	13,140	13,140	-353	---
Pollution control (Sec. 106).....	238,786	250,264	204,264	-34,522	-46,000
(Water quality monitoring).....	(18,463)	(11,300)	(11,300)	(-7,163)	---
Pollution prevention.....	4,930	5,039	4,930	---	-109
Public water system supervision.....	105,489	109,700	105,489	---	-4,211
Radon.....	8,058	8,074	8,058	---	-16
State and local air quality management.....	236,107	305,500	201,580	-34,527	-103,920

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Toxics substances compliance.....	5,089	5,201	5,089	---	-112
Tribal air quality management.....	13,273	13,566	13,273	---	-293
Tribal general assistance program.....	67,739	71,375	62,875	-4,864	-8,500
Underground injection control (UIC).....	10,869	11,109	10,869	---	-240
Underground storage tanks.....	2,495	1,550	1,550	-945	---
Wetlands program development.....	16,796	15,167	15,167	-1,629	---
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,104,233	1,201,389	1,002,393	-101,840	-198,996
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,758,913	3,860,430	2,610,393	-1,148,520	-1,250,037
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.....	8,822,117	9,023,000	7,289,202	-1,532,915	-1,733,798
Rescission.....	-140,000	-50,000	-140,000	---	-90,000
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,682,117	8,973,000	7,149,202	-1,532,915	-1,823,798
Appropriations.....	(8,822,117)	(9,023,000)	(7,289,202)	(-1,532,915)	(-1,733,798)
Rescissions.....	(-140,000)	(-50,000)	(-140,000)	---	(-90,000)
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest and Rangeland Research					
Forest inventory and analysis.....	66,805	61,939	66,805	---	+4,866
Research and development programs.....	239,832	233,834	210,477	-29,355	-23,357
(Global Climate Change Science).....	(31,793)	(28,357)	---	(-31,793)	(-28,357)
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Forest and rangeland research.....	306,637	295,773	277,282	-29,355	-18,491
State and Private Forestry					
Forest Health Management:					
Federal lands forest health management.....	56,737	55,613	54,501	-2,236	-1,112
Cooperative lands forest health management.....	48,821	43,942	43,063	-5,758	-879
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	105,558	99,555	97,564	-7,994	-1,991
Cooperative Fire Protection:					
State fire assistance.....	32,358	33,201	32,537	+179	-664
Volunteer fire assistance.....	6,680	7,000	6,680	---	-320
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	39,038	40,201	39,217	+179	-984
Cooperative Forestry:					
Forest stewardship.....	32,548	29,449	28,860	-3,688	-589
Forest legacy.....	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	52,894	135,000	3,000	-49,894	-132,000
Community forest and open space conservation.....					
Urban and community forestry.....	1,000	5,000	1,000	---	-4,000
Forest resource information and analysis.....	32,040	32,377	29,042	-2,998	-3,335
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry.....	5,026	---	4,925	-101	+4,925
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry.....	123,508	201,826	66,827	-56,681	-134,999
International forestry.....	9,492	---	5,000	-4,492	+5,000
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, State and Private Forestry.....	277,596	341,582	208,608	-68,988	-132,974
National Forest System					
Land management planning.....	45,033	205,602	30,033	-15,000	-175,569
Inventory and monitoring.....	167,219	---	165,219	-2,000	+165,219
Recreation, heritage and wilderness.....	281,627	290,498	281,627	---	-8,871

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grazing management.....	49,738	45,445	55,445	+5,707	+10,000
Forest products.....	336,049	---	336,722	+673	+336,722
Vegetation and watershed management.....	184,341	---	184,341	---	+184,341
Wildlife and fish habitat management.....	140,260	---	140,260	---	+140,260
(Integrated resource restoration).....	---	(854,242)	---	---	(-854,242)
Restoration of Management and Resources.....	---	659,242	---	---	-659,242
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.....	14,970	40,000	30,000	+15,030	-10,000
Priority watersheds and jobs stabilization.....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
Legacy roads and trails.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Minerals and geology management.....	83,560	78,805	83,560	---	+4,755
Landownership management.....	91,765	85,875	91,765	---	+5,890
Law enforcement operations.....	144,254	144,059	144,059	-195	---
Valles Caldera National Preserve.....	3,432	---	3,432	---	+3,432
Total, National Forest System.....	1,542,248	1,704,526	1,546,463	+4,215	-158,063
Capital Improvement and Maintenance					
Facilities:					
Maintenance.....	90,450	82,661	42,661	-47,789	-40,000
Construction.....	44,550	18,124	7,000	-37,550	-11,124
Subtotal.....	135,000	100,785	49,661	-85,339	-51,124
Roads:					
Maintenance.....	167,868	148,944	166,885	-983	+17,941
Construction.....	27,327	8,874	35,000	+7,673	+26,126
Subtotal.....	195,195	157,818	201,885	+6,690	+44,067
Trails:					
Maintenance.....	69,821	63,422	63,846	-5,975	+424
Construction.....	18,560	18,766	18,560	---	-206
Subtotal.....	88,381	82,188	82,406	-5,975	+218
Deferred maintenance.....	9,158	9,136	9,136	-22	---
Legacy road and trail remediation.....	44,910	---	35,000	-9,910	+35,000
Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance...	472,644	349,927	378,088	-94,556	+28,161
Deferral of road and trail fund payment.....	-13,000	-12,000	-12,000	+1,000	---
Total, Capital improvement and maintenance.....	459,644	337,927	366,088	-93,556	+28,161
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions.....	19,235	72,500	---	-19,235	-72,500
Acquisition management.....	9,000	12,000	7,000	-2,000	-5,000
Cash equalization.....	400	1,000	1,000	+600	---
Critical inholdings/wilderness protection.....	4,299	4,500	4,500	+201	---
Total, Land Acquisition.....	32,934	90,000	12,500	-20,434	-77,500
Acquisition of land for national forests, special acts	1,048	955	955	-93	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	250	227	227	-23	---
Range betterment fund.....	3,600	3,262	3,262	-338	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	50	45	45	-5	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	2,577	---	2,000	-577	+2,000
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire operations:					
Wildland fire preparedness.....	673,650	1,006,052	1,006,052	+332,402	---
Wildland fire suppression operations.....	995,511	538,720	538,720	-456,791	---
Subtotal, Fire operations.....	1,669,161	1,544,772	1,544,772	-124,389	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R. 2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other operations:					
Hazardous fuels.....	349,584	62,015	334,584	-15,000	+272,569
(Hazardous Fuels Base Program)*.....	(334,614)	(249,015)	---	(-334,614)	(-249,015)
(Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund)**	(9,980)	---	---	(-9,980)	---
(Biomass Grants).....	(4,990)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+10)	---
Rehabilitation.....	11,477	---	---	-11,477	---
Fire plan research and development.....	23,869	21,734	21,734	-2,135	---
Joint fire sciences program.....	7,984	7,262	7,262	-722	---
Forest health management (federal lands).....	20,710	12,983	17,983	-2,727	+5,000
Forest health management (co-op lands).....	11,405	6,366	10,366	-1,039	+4,000
State fire assistance.....	64,870	45,564	61,032	-3,838	+15,468
Volunteer fire assistance.....	8,982	6,366	7,366	-1,616	+1,000
Subtotal, Other operations.....	498,881	162,290	460,327	-38,554	+298,037
Subtotal, Wildland fire management.....	2,168,042	1,707,062	2,005,099	-162,943	+298,037
* Non-WUI haz fuels moved to IRR under FY12 request					
**Moved to IRR under FY12 request					
Rescission.....	-200,000	-192,000	---	+200,000	+192,000
Use of emergency suppression funds.....	---	---	-200,000	-200,000	-200,000
Total, Wildland fire management.....	1,968,042	1,515,062	1,805,099	-162,943	+290,037
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account.....	290,418	315,886	290,418	---	-25,468
Rescission.....	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, all wildland fire accounts.....	2,058,460	1,830,948	2,095,517	+37,057	+264,569
Forest Service payments to communities (leg proposal).....	---	328,000	---	---	-328,000
Total, Forest Service without Wildland fire.....	2,626,584	2,774,297	2,417,430	-209,154	-356,867
TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE.....	4,685,044	4,933,245	4,512,947	-172,097	-420,298

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Indian Health Services

Clinical Services:

IHS and tribal health delivery

Hospital and health clinic programs.....	1,762,865	1,963,886	1,858,433	+95,568	-105,453
Dental health program.....	152,634	170,859	166,492	+13,858	-4,367
Mental health program.....	72,786	81,117	78,023	+5,237	-3,094
Alcohol and substance abuse program.....	194,409	211,693	202,102	+7,693	-9,591
Contract health services.....	779,927	948,646	836,685	+56,758	-111,961
(Catastrophic health emergency fund).....	(47,904)	(58,000)	(51,500)	(+3,596)	(-6,500)
Subtotal.....	2,962,621	3,376,201	3,141,735	+179,114	-234,466

Preventive Health:

Public health nursing.....	63,943	70,613	68,646	+4,703	-1,967
Health education.....	16,649	18,190	17,680	+1,031	-510
Community health representatives program.....	61,505	65,746	63,867	+2,362	-1,879
Immunization (Alaska).....	1,930	2,064	2,005	+75	-59
Subtotal.....	144,027	156,613	152,198	+8,171	-4,415
Urban health program.....	43,053	46,745	45,525	+2,472	-1,220
Indian health professions.....	40,661	42,016	41,934	+1,273	-82
Tribal management.....	2,581	2,762	2,757	+176	-5
Direct operations.....	68,583	73,636	70,095	+1,512	-3,541

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Self-governance.....	6,054	6,329	6,317	+263	-12
Contract support costs.....	397,693	461,837	573,761	+176,068	+111,924
Total, Indian Health Services.....	3,665,273	4,166,139	4,034,322	+369,049	-131,817
Indian Health Facilities					
Maintenance and improvement.....	53,807	57,078	55,439	+1,632	-1,639
Sanitation facilities construction.....	95,665	79,710	77,002	-18,663	-2,708
Health care facilities construction.....	39,156	85,184	85,724	+46,568	+540
Facilities and environmental health support.....	192,701	210,992	205,083	+12,382	-5,909
Equipment.....	22,618	24,705	24,011	+1,393	-694
Subtotal, Indian Health Facilities.....	403,947	457,669	447,259	+43,312	-10,410
Use of prior year unobligated balances.....	---	---	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Indian Health Facilities.....	403,947	457,669	427,259	+23,312	-30,410
TOTAL, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.....	4,069,220	4,623,808	4,461,581	+392,361	-162,227
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	79,054	81,085	79,054	---	-2,031
AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	76,638	76,337	74,039	-2,599	-2,298
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES..	4,224,912	4,781,230	4,614,674	+389,762	-166,556
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,153	3,444	2,661	-492	-783
CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,777	11,147	10,000	-777	-1,147
OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,984	9,570	7,530	-454	-2,040
INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT					
Payment to the Institute.....	8,283	9,225	7,900	-383	-1,325
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and Expenses					
Museum and Research Institutes:					
National Air and Space Museum.....	18,359	18,246	18,246	-113	---
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory.....	24,336	24,035	24,035	-301	---
Major scientific instrumentation.....	3,814	3,822	3,814	---	-8
Universe Center.....	200	300	200	---	-100
National Museum of Natural History.....	48,318	48,163	48,163	-155	---
National Zoological Park.....	23,306	23,352	23,306	---	-46
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center.....	3,765	3,773	3,756	-9	-17
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.....	14,867	12,239	12,239	-2,628	---
Biodiversity Center.....	500	2,100	500	---	-1,600

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art.....	6,123	6,135	6,113	-10	-22
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage.....	2,295	2,300	2,282	-13	-18
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum.....	4,051	4,244	4,051	---	-193
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.....	4,347	4,356	4,347	---	-9
National Museum of African Art.....	4,452	4,461	4,452	---	-9
World Cultures Center.....	300	300	300	---	---
Anacostia Community Museum.....	2,059	2,063	2,048	-11	-15
Archives of American Art.....	1,876	1,880	1,858	-18	-22
National Museum of African American History and Culture.....	13,298	13,437	12,894	-404	-543
National Museum of American History.....	22,392	22,637	22,349	-43	-288
National Museum of the American Indian.....	32,335	31,900	31,900	-435	---
National Portrait Gallery.....	5,987	5,999	5,967	-20	-32
Smithsonian American Art Museum.....	9,325	9,343	9,245	-80	-98
American Experience Center.....	300	800	300	---	-500
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes.....	246,605	245,885	242,365	-4,240	-3,520
Mission enabling:					
Program support and outreach:					
Outreach.....	9,592	9,291	9,291	-301	---
Communications.....	2,490	2,594	2,342	-148	-252
Institution-wide programs.....	11,607	10,928	10,839	-768	-89
Office of Exhibits Central.....	3,006	3,012	2,982	-24	-30
Museum Support Center.....	1,870	1,874	1,858	-12	-16
Museum Conservation Institute.....	3,230	3,236	3,119	-111	-117
Smithsonian Institution Archives.....	2,189	2,193	2,054	-135	-139
Smithsonian Institution Libraries.....	9,963	9,983	9,963	---	-20
Subtotal, Program support and outreach.....	43,947	43,111	42,448	-1,499	-663
Office of Chief Information Officer.....	45,526	46,144	43,536	-1,990	-2,608
Administration.....	33,293	33,949	33,293	---	-656
Inspector General.....	2,602	2,607	2,602	---	-5
Facilities services:					
Facilities maintenance.....	70,000	72,107	70,000	---	-2,107
Facilities operations, security and support.....	192,916	192,727	192,727	-189	---
Subtotal, Facilities services.....	262,916	264,834	262,727	-189	-2,107
Subtotal, Mission enabling.....	388,284	390,645	384,606	-3,678	-6,039
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	634,889	636,530	626,971	-7,918	-9,559
Facilities Capital					
Revitalization.....	91,940	84,830	59,580	-32,360	-25,250
Facilities planning and design.....	32,810	140,170	65,170	+32,360	-75,000
Total, Facilities Capital.....	124,750	225,000	124,750	---	-100,250
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.....	759,639	861,530	751,721	-7,918	-109,809
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART					
Salaries and Expenses					
Care and utilization of art collections.....	36,828	36,708	36,708	-120	---
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds....	29,209	35,499	31,209	+2,000	-4,290
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents.....	23,729	23,509	23,509	-220	---
General administration.....	20,759	23,065	20,759	---	-2,306
Total, Salaries and Expenses.....	110,525	118,781	112,185	+1,660	-6,596

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings					
Base program.....	48,125	19,219	13,938	-34,187	-5,281
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART.....	158,650	138,000	126,123	-32,527	-11,877
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS					
Operations and maintenance.....	22,455	23,200	22,455	---	-745
Capital repair and restoration.....	13,892	13,650	13,650	-242	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.....	36,347	36,850	36,105	-242	-745
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS					
Salaries and expenses.....	11,203	11,005	10,000	-1,203	-1,005
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Direct grants.....	67,243	58,208	54,200	-13,043	-4,008
Challenge America grants.....	7,984	8,000	6,000	-1,984	-2,000
New Our Town.....	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	75,227	71,208	62,200	-13,027	-9,008
State partnerships:					
State and regional.....	39,469	34,737	37,000	-2,469	+2,263
Underserved set-aside.....	10,683	9,402	9,000	-1,683	-402
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	50,152	44,139	46,000	-4,152	+1,861
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Grants.....	125,379	115,347	108,200	-17,179	-7,147
Program support.....	1,876	2,845	1,750	-126	-1,095
Administration.....	27,435	28,063	25,050	-2,385	-3,013
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Arts.....	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Bridging cultures.....	1,500	4,000	2,000	+500	-2,000
Federal/State partnership.....	42,450	40,100	38,000	-4,450	-2,100
Preservation and access.....	16,500	15,600	12,750	-3,750	-2,850
Public programs.....	15,000	13,800	12,000	-3,000	-1,800
Research programs.....	16,250	14,900	12,250	-4,000	-2,650
Education programs.....	13,750	13,550	12,000	-1,750	-1,550
Program development.....	500	500	500	---	---
We The People Initiative grants.....	3,219	---	4,750	+1,531	+4,750
Digital humanities initiatives.....	4,000	4,250	3,500	-500	-750
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Grants.....	113,169	106,700	97,750	-15,419	-8,950

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012 (H.R.2584)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Matching Grants:					
Treasury funds.....	4,800	2,750	2,000	-2,800	-750
Challenge grants.....	9,471	8,750	8,000	-1,471	-750
Subtotal, Matching grants.....	14,271	11,500	10,000	-4,271	-1,500
Administration.....	27,250	28,055	27,250	---	-805
Total, Humanities.....	154,690	146,255	135,000	-19,690	-11,255
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES.....	309,380	292,510	270,000	-39,380	-22,510
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,289	2,400	2,234	-55	-166
NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS					
Grants.....	2,994	---	---	-2,994	---
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,896	6,108	5,498	-398	-610
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,490	8,154	8,133	-357	-21
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM					
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	49,024	52,694	50,524	+1,500	-2,170
PRESIDIO TRUST					
Operations.....	14,970	12,000	12,000	-2,970	---
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	6,000	2,000	+2,000	-4,000
Capital construction.....	---	83,768	28,000	+28,000	-55,768
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION.	---	89,768	30,000	+30,000	-59,768
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL, TITLE III, RELATED AGENCIES.....	10,299,035	11,258,880	10,458,050	+159,015	-800,830
Appropriations.....	(10,699,035)	(11,450,880)	(10,458,050)	(-240,985)	(-992,830)
Rescissions.....	(-400,000)	(-192,000)	---	(+400,000)	(+192,000)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Cabin user fee (Sec. 417).....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
GRAND TOTAL.....	29,610,782	31,343,710	27,519,420	-2,091,362	-3,824,290
Appropriations.....	(30,436,348)	(31,615,710)	(27,689,420)	(-2,746,928)	(-3,926,290)
Rescissions.....	(-825,566)	(-272,000)	(-170,000)	(+655,566)	(+102,000)
Discretionary total.....	29,559,000	31,289,290	27,465,000	-2,094,000	-3,824,290

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day, a sad day for the environment and for America's great natural and cultural heritage. H.R. 2584, with its deep cuts in important environmental and natural resource programs and shocking array of special interest riders and funding limitations, falls far short of meeting our responsibilities to protect and wisely use our Nation's natural resources.

The bill before the House today is more than \$2 billion below the current spending level, and it's almost \$4 billion below the President's request. It's even \$324 million below the CR level of H.R. 1 that was passed by the House just in February.

Given the subcommittee's punishingly low 302(b) allocation, I do recognize the difficulties that Chairman SIMPSON of the subcommittee and Chairman ROGERS of the full committee faced in crafting the bill. I do appreciate their efforts, Mr. SIMPSON's efforts particularly and Mr. COLE's, to protect funding for American Indian programs. I only wish that that protection could have extended to other important portions of this bill.

But as bad as the funding cuts are in this bill, what is most important is the extent to which the majority has filled this bill with extremist legislative riders and funding limitations. The bill is short on needed funds and long on antienvironmental riders.

H.R. 2584 is not so much a spending bill as the fulfillment of a wish list for special interests. Oil companies, cattle grazers, industrial agribusiness, miners, and those who wish to pollute our air and water for greater profit all have their special provisions tucked away into this bill. It is a dump truck of provisions for special interests.

In addition, this bill picks up where H.R. 1 left off and includes dozens of deep cuts in conservation and environmental protection programs, while the extractive or consumptive uses of our public lands are shielded from cuts and given a pass from complying with our Nation's landmark environmental laws. We continually hear from the majority that the pain of budget cuts has to be shared by all, but in this bill they have chosen winners and losers—the extractors and the exploiters and the despoilers of the forests are the winners and the animals and the people who depend upon clean air and water are the losers. The animals, the environment, the forests, the waterways, and humans who depend on clean air and water all lose.

This bill continues the majority's assault on the Environmental Protection Agency with deep cuts. After the EPA budget was cut by 16 percent in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further reduction of 18 percent for next year. In other words, a 34 percent cut in environmental protection. Cuts of nearly 40 percent are made to the clean water and safe

drinking water grant programs, just at the time when the States and localities have run out of money to try to provide for clean water and to deal with storm water overflow and all of the plumbing infrastructure that is necessary throughout our country. When the majority says it wants to rein in the EPA, what they're really reining in is the ability to protect clean air and clean water. It also cuts more than 600 positions in EPA's regulatory workforce.

I am extremely disappointed at the majority's decision to prohibit funds for the Endangered Species Act listings and critical habitat designations. These are the vital first steps needed to begin the recovery process for 260 species currently at risk of extinction. Under the guise of sending a signal to the authorizing committee, this bill attacks the very heart of the Endangered Species Act. There are a great many unauthorized programs in this bill.

Wildlife programs overall are hard hit by this bill. State and tribal wildlife grants are cut by two-thirds, multinational species conservation by a fifth, and cooperative endangered species conservation by 95 percent. Even funding for the National Wildlife Refuge System will be cut by 7½ percent.

Our national parks and forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, and other conservation units deserve better than what this bill provides. As stewards of these magnificent resources that were passed down to us, we have a responsibility to defend and preserve them for future generations. Spending reductions like the 78 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a nearly 80 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the lowest level it has ever been, and a 33 percent cut to the National Landscape Conservation System will place at risk some of our most precious resources.

I would also like to note that this bill is about more than our natural resources and the environment, and while the cultural activities and institutions are a small portion of the bill, they are a vital part of our communities and they do enhance our economy and our way of life. Yet these programs and activities would receive substantial cuts under this bill as well.

I am also struck by the contradictions contained in H.R. 2584. Here are just two examples:

On the one hand, the bill allocates millions of dollars to restore the Everglades in Florida, yet the majority includes a funding limitation that will permit the pollution of the Everglades. The bill also includes funding to deal with the continuing fallout from uranium mining on the Navajo Indian Reservation, yet it includes language that will expose Grand Canyon National Park and the millions of Americans who depend upon the Colorado River for their drinking water to the well-known dangers of uranium mining, and they give away the publicly owned uranium to a foreign-owned Asian mining

company. Imagine, giving away publicly owned uranium to a foreign firm.

The list of legislative riders and funding limitations in the bill is long: National Environmental Policy Act waivers, limitations on judicial review, and the blocking of air and water pollution controls. Whole legislative texts have been dumped into this bill. These riders and limitations have nothing to do with deficit reduction and everything to do with carrying out an extreme ideological agenda.

Repealing environmental regulations doesn't save money; it costs money. Keeping toxins out of our air and water is a great deal cheaper than cleaning up the damage or dealing with the adverse health effects. Preventing the Deepwater Horizon disaster would have been far cheaper than having to clean it up after the fact.

Each rider or funding limitation seems designed to benefit one industry or another. These provisions have become the new earmarks, with 39 such provisions already in the bill, and more are going to be proposed to be added.

While this bill rewards businesses and industries that seek to delay or undermine environmental protections, it penalizes others who try to do the right thing. As just one example, American Electric Power recently announced it's going to stop work on a low-carbon, coal-fired power plant, carbon sequestration, showing it can work, but they're going to stop work on it in light of the pullback in regulating emissions related to climate change. They see what the Congress is doing, they see what their competitors are doing, so they've decided not to do the right thing because we're making it too expensive to do the right thing.

With the funding cuts and special interest provisions, it's no wonder that the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2584 runs five pages with its veto threat. I concur with the administration's views on the bill and under general leave will submit the administration's statement.

We owe it to our constituents and our communities to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink, to protect public health from the dangers of mercury and arsenic and lead. Imagine, we have more than 500 coal-fired power plants in this country and they emit more than 78,000 pounds of mercury, and yet one drop of mercury will poison an entire lake.

□ 1410

That's what we should be looking to, and not tying EPA's hands. We ought to be good stewards of the abundant natural and cultural heritage passed down to us. President Johnson noted in 1964, and I'm going to quote, "If future generations are to remember us with gratitude rather than contempt, we must leave them something more than the miracles of technology. We should be leaving them a glimpse of the world as it was in the beginning, not just after we got through with it."

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2584 falls far short of our responsibility to present and future generations. And so I obviously oppose the bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2584—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012
(Rep. Rogers, R-KY)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. The Administration is committed to ensuring the Nation lives within its means and reducing the deficit so that the Nation can compete in the global economy and win the future. That is why the President put forth a comprehensive fiscal framework that reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion, supports economic growth and long-term job creation, protects critical investments, meets the commitments made to provide dignity and security to Americans no matter their circumstances, and provides for our national security.

The Administration strongly opposes a number of provisions in this bill, including ideological and political provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation. If the President is presented with a bill that undermines ongoing conservation, public health, and environmental protection efforts through funding limits or restrictions, his senior advisors would recommend he veto the bill.

While overall funding limits and subsequent allocations remain unclear pending the outcome of ongoing bipartisan, bicameral discussions between the Administration and congressional leadership on the Nation's long-term fiscal picture, the Administration has concerns regarding the level of resources the bill would provide for a number of programs in a way that undermines core government functions, investments key to economic growth and job creation, as well as protection of public health and the environment and preservation of our Nation's natural resource heritage, including, but not limited to:

Department of the Interior (DOI)

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Conservation Grants. The level of funding provided to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and State and Tribal Wildlife grants, as well as the termination of Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act grants, would threaten the ability of States and private organizations to conserve and provide access to habitat, undermining the conservation of game and non-game species.

Safety Inspection Fees. The bill does not include user fees to cover inspections of oil and gas production facilities offshore and onshore. Without these fees, taxpayers, rather than industry, would have to shoulder the cost of these operations, which are critical to ensuring safe and responsible energy development.

FWS Operations. The funding provided for operations would seriously degrade the ability of FWS to maintain the network of National Wildlife Refuges and fulfill other statutory responsibilities. This would result in delays in environmental compliance reviews, which could impede major infrastructure projects, including road construction, water delivery, and other federally funded projects that directly benefit State and local governments.

Landsat. The bill does not provide funding to begin the acquisition of the next Landsat satellite, ending a 40-year stream of data that is used by Federal, State, local and Tribal governments and the private sector to make informed land and resource manage-

ment decisions and to assess the impacts of those decisions over time.

DOI and Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The funding in the bill for LWCF programs would deny willing sellers the opportunity to sell land holdings, and severely impair the ability of Federal, State, and local officials, as well as private landowners, to preserve and manage areas important to wildlife, recreationalists, and sportsmen and women.

Wildland Fire Suppression. The bill's funding for suppression is substantially below the 10-year average, which is the accepted method for calculating suppression requirements. While the bill directs DOI and the Forest Service to use emergency fire suppression balances to make up the shortfall, this strategy carries high risk given the high fire activity to date and the cancellation of balances in FY 2011 appropriations.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA Operating Budget. At the funding level provided, EPA will be unable to implement its core mission of protecting human health and the environment. Research necessary to support this mission will be curtailed, and restoration of key ecosystems such as the Great Lakes and the Chesapeake Bay will be delayed.

State Revolving Funds (SRFs). The level of funding provided in the bill would result in approximately 400 fewer wastewater and drinking water projects, and impede EPA's ability to reach the long-term goal of providing approximately 5 percent of total water infrastructure funding annually.

State Categorical Grants. The funding provided in the bill for grants to States would impede States' ability to carry out critical public health and environmental activities such as air quality monitoring and water quality permitting. This would greatly reduce core high-priority State environmental programs at a time of declining State budgets.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Programs. The reductions in funding for GHG programs and regulations severely limit actions the Administration could take under current law to permit, control, and monitor greenhouse gases and would block EPA's efforts to reduce GHG emissions from vehicles and large stationary sources.

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI). The level of resources for the GLRI would reduce the ability of Federal agencies and their partners to clean up contaminated sediments, fight invasive species, restore habitat, and improve water quality in this critical ecosystem.

High Priority Ecosystems Funding. The level of funding provided for the Chesapeake Bay would jeopardize the successful clean-up of the Nation's largest estuary.

Responsible Energy Development and Oil Spill Response. The level of resources in the bill would eliminate efforts to increase the frequency of environmental compliance inspections at oil facilities. In addition, the bill does not include emergency transfer authority necessary to improve the Government's ability to prevent and respond to oil spills.

Smart Growth. The bill terminates funding for EPA's Smart Growth program, which contributes to efforts to assist communities in coordinating infrastructure investments and minimizing environmental impact of development.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)

The funding in the bill for the NEA, which is the largest national funder of the arts in the United States, would cut support for arts

organizations across the country during a time when private and State arts funding is also highly constrained.

Council on Environmental Quality

The Administration's ability to guide the Executive Branch's environmental policies and programs will be substantially reduced at the funding level in the bill.

The Administration strongly opposes problematic policy and language issues that are beyond the scope of funding legislation, including, but not limited to, the following provisions in this bill:

Restrictions on Implementing the Endangered Species Act. Preventing FWS from implementing key provisions of the Endangered Species Act will only result in increased costs and delays in the future.

Mountain Top Mining Reform. Preventing the Office of Surface Mining from developing or implementing the stream buffer zone rule could increase the risk of litigation and potentially delay sustainable coal mining.

Mineral Withdrawal Prohibition. Prohibiting DOI from restricting new mining claims on approximately 1 million acres of Federal lands near the Grand Canyon will reverse a temporary moratorium on new uranium and other mining claims. The Secretary of the Interior is currently assessing the impact to water quality in Grand Canyon National Park to ensure that any future uranium or other mining activity in the area does not lead to the human health and environmental impacts seen from previous mining-caused contamination of ground water and drinking water supplies.

Gray Wolves. The Endangered Species Act expressly gives the public the right to challenge listing decisions. Restricting judicial review of any published final rule to delist gray wolves in Wyoming or the Great Lakes region from the Endangered Species Act would deny the public an opportunity to make sure that a future listing decision on gray wolves is based on science.

Protecting Wilderness Characteristics Secretarial Order. Prohibiting the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) from implementing Secretarial Order 3310, which directs BLM to use the public resource management planning process to designate certain lands with wilderness characteristics as "Wild Lands" is unnecessary given the Department's policy that includes collaboration with stakeholders to identify public lands that may be appropriate candidates for congressional designation under the Wilderness Act.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions from Stationary Sources. Preventing EPA from regulating GHG emissions from stationary sources would prevent the Agency from proposing or finalizing new regulations to control GHG emissions from power plants and petroleum refineries, increasing the risk of long-term environmental consequences from GHG emissions. EPA is under two settlement agreements to complete these rules in 2012.

Clean Air Act Permitting. Section 431(a)(2)-(4) of the bill effectively overrides Federal and State-issued permits for emissions from industrial facilities that are very large emitters of greenhouse gases by stating that the Clean Air Act's requirement to obtain a permit has no legal effect and that no lawsuits may be brought against a facility due to uncontrolled greenhouse gas emissions.

Light-Duty Greenhouse Gas Standards. Section 453 of the bill undermines Executive Branch efforts to set standards that will save consumers money at the pump and reduce GHG emissions through increased vehicle fuel efficiency on Model Year 2017-2025 Light-Duty Vehicles.

Utility Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)/Transport Rule. Section

462 of the bill blocks EPA from implementing its utility MACT rule to control air toxics emissions, as well as the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule controlling interstate transport of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions from power plants. This provision interferes with the long-delayed implementation of major air pollution rules covering pollution from power plants.

Mountaintop Mining Coordination and Guidance. Section 433 of the bill prohibits implementing or enforcing an EPA/Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)/Office of Surface Mining coordination Memorandum of Understanding and EPA guidance on the Clean Water Act/National Environmental Policy Act and mountaintop mining. This issue is currently undergoing judicial review and should be allowed to conclude without congressional intervention.

Clean Water Act. Section 435 of the bill would stop an important Administration effort to provide clarity around which water bodies are covered by the Clean Water Act. The Administration's work in this area will help to protect the public health and economic benefits provided to the American public by clean water, while also bringing greater certainty to business planning and investment and reducing an ongoing loss of wetlands and other sensitive aquatic resources. The existing regulations were the subject of two recent Supreme Court cases, in which the Court itself indicated the need for greater regulatory clarity regarding the appropriate scope of the Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

Outer Continental Shelf Drilling. Section 443 of the bill limits EPA's Clean Air Act permitting authority for Outer Continental Shelf drilling and would eliminate the Agency's discretion in considering human health and environmental protections when issuing these permits.

Integrated Risk Information System. Section 444 of the bill withholds funding for EPA to take administrative action following its assessment of risk for certain chemicals. This provision would delay scientific assessment of environmental contaminants and could delay regulatory or other Agency actions designed to protect public health.

Limiting Compliance of the Endangered Species Act. Section 447 of the bill would prevent EPA from implementing a biological opinion related to pesticides if the opinion identifies modifying, canceling, or suspending registration of a pesticide registered under FIFRA. This could undermine efforts to protect species from being put into jeopardy from a Federal project and could stop development and delay issuance of permits.

Lead Renovation and Repair Rule. Section 450 of the bill prohibits funding for EPA to implement the 2008 Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) rule, as amended, until after industry develops and EPA approves different lead paint test kits. This would undermine efforts to protect sensitive populations from exposure to lead, a known toxin to children and developing fetuses, during home renovation projects. The currently available test kits allow renovators to comply with the 2008 rule.

Reducing Emissions from Cement Facilities. The language would prevent common sense deployment of technology that has been around for decades that will improve public health by reducing emissions of pollutants, including known carcinogens such as dioxin, from cement facilities.

Fighting Fraud, Waste, and Abuse. Sections 449 and 451 of the bill fall short of their intended purposes of protecting the interest of the Nation's taxpayers. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to achieve the common goal of fighting fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal contracts, grants, and other Federal assistance.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process moves forward to ensure the Administration can support enactment of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the esteemed chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise today to commend this bill to our colleagues and urge that it be passed. It includes \$27.5 billion in Federal spending. That's a reduction of \$2.1 billion below last year, \$3.8 billion below the President's request.

Some have complained that these cuts are too much, too fast. But it's important to remember that these agencies and programs have seen unprecedented massive increases in spending in recent years. This sort of excess has contributed to our astronomical debt and is threatening our recovery. We simply can't fund unnecessary and ineffective programs when we are borrowing 42 cents on every dollar we spend. We just simply can't afford it.

This legislation makes smart, significant cuts across each and every agency funded by this bill. The bill still adequately funds the agencies that are important to the health of our citizens, the stability of our economy, and the preservation of our environment, but we've made some priority adjustments in areas that can and should withstand lower budgets.

Some areas that will see bigger reductions include climate change programs, which are trimmed 22 percent from last year, and land acquisition funding, which is at a level nearly 79 percent lower than last year.

Frankly, many of the cuts in this bill are just plain common sense, particularly when it comes to the Environmental Protection Agency. The reductions and provisions in this bill were made with very good reason—to rein in unparalleled, out-of-control spending and job-killing overregulation by the EPA.

Though we all appreciate the core mission of the EPA, this agency has

lost grips with economic reality and has become the epitome of the continued and damaging regulatory overreach of this administration. We can't allow an agency to circumvent the authority of Congress, especially when it has such destructive effects on our Nation's economic recovery.

I'd like to say that we've heard from Americans all across the country and across every sector of the economy who attribute harsh regulatory burdens to their economic uncertainty, uncertainty that's crushing job growth.

It's my hope that this legislation sends the message loud and clear: Legislation by regulation must stop. We've restricted funding for EPA personnel, as well as addressed EPA's flawed greenhouse gas regulations and de facto moratorium on mining permits in Appalachia. It's my hope that provisions like these will return the EPA to a better working order, facilitating a more effective government, sending money where it really needs to go, and removing burdensome barriers to job creation to clear the way for economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN, the subcommittee, and all of the staff for all their hard work on this very tough bill. Chairman SIMPSON has led the way on an excellent bill, I think, that makes good on our promise to reduce government spending with real significant spending reforms.

His subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, held 22 oversight hearings, more than any other of the 12 subcommittees on Appropriations. I'm confident that they've gone above and beyond their duty to ensure that these cuts come from wasteful and redundant programs. I know these decisions were not made lightly, were not made easy, but they are responsible, and will help us move in the right direction.

Although it's been difficult at times, the House should be proud to be moving this year's appropriations process in regular order, the first time in years. With this bill we will have finished more than half of the fiscal 12 appropriation bills before the recess. And nearly all of the bills have been moved through subcommittee or full committee, and therefore are on cue to come to the full body. This return to regular order has contributed to thoughtful, collaborative appropriations bills that reflect the will of the American people and will help get our Nation's finances in order.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the very distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. I rise to state my opposition to H.R. 2584, the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill.

But before I state the reasons for my strong opposition, I want to, again recognize Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN and their staffs for all the hard work that was necessary to put together the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill. I also want to repeat my gratitude to the majority for being inclusive when developing this bill.

That being said, however, the low allocation foisted on the Interior Subcommittee made it impossible to develop a bill that is responsible and reasonable, so it is no surprise that the resulting bill will harm the environment and our ongoing efforts to preserve America's natural heritage. Two key examples of this potential damage are that the bill includes the lowest level of spending in the Land and Water Conservation Fund in more than 40 years, and funding levels for EPA not seen in more than a decade.

Overall, the allocation for the bill is 7 percent below the amount enacted in the current year, a level that will have a negative impact on our natural resource agencies and on the Environmental Protection Agency. After the EPA took a substantial cut of 16 percent in the current fiscal year, 2011, the Republican majority is now proposing a further reduction in the agency's budget of 18 percent. You add that together, it's a 34-percent reduction in just this year.

This bill would substantially diminish the capacity of EPA to carry out its responsibilities, which may actually be the goal of some of my colleagues on the other side. But the repercussions will be felt across the Nation, including an ever-growing backlog of water treatment infrastructure projects and a decline in air and water quality.

As was pointed out in a recent Washington Post article, the vast majority of the EPA's funds pass through to States and localities that are already squeezed by budget cuts.

□ 1420

These infrastructure projects create jobs in communities all across the country and provide one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. The Bush administration's EPA administrator estimated that there was a \$688 billion nationwide backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, and that total is even larger today. That backlog will not disappear if we just ignore it, but as we have seen in so many cases this year, the majority has decided to push this problem further down the road.

In addition to the clearly insufficient levels of funding across the board in this legislation, we were surprised that the majority also included a wish list of special interest riders to the bill that will handcuff the EPA and the Department of the Interior. These types of riders are largely ideological, have no impact on deficit reduction, and will be rejected by the Senate and the President, hopefully.

It seems that special interest riders have become the new earmarks—and I support earmarks. This bill was made even worse when the majority adopted more special interest riders with amendments that were approved at full committee, and I fear that there will be more policy amendments offered on the floor as we consider this bill.

One of the riders is language that would effectively block any funding to the Fish and Wildlife Service for new listings under the Endangered Species Act. As Mr. MORAN said, there are 260 candidate species waiting to be listed, and they will not receive the protection of the Endangered Species Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Here is the situation that the Fish and Wildlife Service faces in the administration of the ESA. Speaking of that 260, of that total, there are just under 30 species that are poised for listing in the near future. The spending provisions in this bill would block further activity to protect these declining species. And remember, if you delay listing too long, a species will go extinct, thus making recovery impossible.

I also will be strongly supporting the amendments that aim to remove these riders. These amendments include an attempt to protect Grand Canyon National Park and the folks who depend on the Colorado River for drinking water from the potential danger from new uranium mines. Another amendment that I strongly support will increase funding for sanitation facilities for Native American communities.

In closing, I do want to reiterate my praise expressed at subcommittee mark for Chairman SIMPSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COLE and other subcommittee members for the funding levels for programs serving American Indians. It is gratifying that this subcommittee's bipartisan commitment to tribal programs forged over the last few years has been continued by the new majority.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, 2 months ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would remove gray wolves from the Endangered Species Act list in areas covering the northern Rocky Mountain States and roughly the easternmost one-third of the State of Washington, the eastern quarter of the State of Oregon, and a small piece of Utah. I understand that H.R. 2584 also would exempt from judicial review any final rule issued by the Secretary that delists wolves in the State of Wyoming and the western Great Lakes. So I commend the chairman for your leadership to see that these States are

given a chance to succeed in their management of species.

As with other decisions, the Secretary of the Interior's May announcement does not resolve the problem for many agricultural areas in States that don't fit neatly within the Fish and Wildlife Service's arbitrarily set geographical boundaries, and it reverses a policy that the Fish and Wildlife Service itself implemented by regulation in 2003 in which wolves were delisted in all of the State of Washington and other areas with appropriate State recovery measures in place.

Under the current administration's policy, in my own district in central Washington, wolves will be delisted on the eastern side up to a highway that cuts through a heavy agriculture area. Wolves on one side of the highway will be listed, the other side not. The same is true in Oregon and Utah.

I appreciate the steps the gentleman has included in this bill to create a more rational approach toward delisting these recovered wolves by allowing the States to manage the populations using sound wildlife management principles. I want to confirm my understanding that the bill and accompanying report language on page 10 is intended to include all States in their entirety within the northern Rocky Mountain area, including Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes. Our intent is to make it clear that States with approved management plans should be given authority to manage delisted wolf populations in their States. The language in the bill ensures that delisting decisions are made by scientists on the ground, not judges in courtrooms.

The report language clarifies that similar bill language should apply to areas where wolves have expanded beyond their original population boundaries once State management plans are in place and the Fish and Wildlife Service determines that the population should be delisted. That language is intended to address States that currently face mixed management challenges, like Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

I know your concern about this issue, and Representative WALDEN from Oregon has shared with me similar concerns as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

As we both know, the problem goes far beyond wolves. The ESA has nearly 1,400 listed species in the U.S. and hundreds of millions of dollars being spent by local, State, Federal, and private entities on ESA activities; yet Federal agencies are being regularly sued for poor science and poorly drafted regulations, and only 20 species have been recovered.

Do you agree with me that the Endangered Species Act is broken and needs to be modernized and updated?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, today's ESA is so highly contentious, political, and litigious that it has become a failure of public policy. Funding authorization for ESA programs expired nearly two decades ago, but because we have continued to fund them, ESA reform continues to stay on the back burner.

This bill calls for a "timeout" for unauthorized funding of new critical habitat or ESA listing decisions in order to encourage authorizers and stakeholders to come to the table to bring the ESA into the 21st century, which it is not now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, a couple of weeks ago Secretary Salazar acknowledged, "There are changes and improvements that can be made to how we deal with endangered species" and that "we need to have an endangered species program that does, in fact, work." I couldn't agree more with the Secretary's statement.

The Natural Resources Committee that I chair has jurisdiction over ESA, as well as NOAA and the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we will be working in coming months to conduct robust oversight and look at much needed proposals to update this law. I appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you on this very important issue.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

It is important that authorizing committees like yours be able to modernize landmark laws like the ESA—laws that were widely supported when they were passed but no longer work as Congress originally intended. No less than 56 agencies or programs in this bill have expired authorizations, and stakeholders and interested Members of Congress should know that these programs are also at risk of defunding if they are not reauthorized. Our bill, hopefully, will provide incentive for stakeholders who have been unwilling to participate in the reform process to finally entertain serious reform of the ESA, which I am sure your committee will actively pursue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, that certainly is the intent that we tend to pursue.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority would respectfully request of the majority that such colloquies, including the one that just transpired, as well as future ones, be shared with the minority. They are meant to be a clarification of language and funding in the bill. And they may very well prompt actions on our part to strike language if we don't fully understand what the intent was, and that may very well apply to the delisting of wolves. So we would appreciate, when the majority

engages in colloquies, sharing that language with the minority.

Would the gentleman like to respond? I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have no problem sharing with you the colloquies that we engage in.

Mr. MORAN. Good. So we would like a copy of the colloquy that just transpired.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the Financial Services Appropriations Committee.

□ 1430

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. First, however, I would like to acknowledge both Chairman SIMPSON and Congressman MORAN, who have worked in a bipartisan and collaborative way throughout the lengthy hearing and markup process. It has been a pleasure for me to serve as a member of this subcommittee.

Unfortunately, this subcommittee's insufficient spending allocation has resulted in deep cuts in funding for important agencies and programs. In addition, numerous anti-environmental riders have been attached to this legislation.

Although there are many to choose from, I would like to mention a few of these cutbacks and what their impact will be on specific agencies and programs. For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is crucial in helping to fund land acquisition and in protecting threatened and endangered species, was funded at \$66 million, which is \$834 million below the budget request.

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants, which play an important role in making sure that we have strategic and effective wildlife conservation programs, were funded at \$22 million, or \$73 million below the request.

The Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, is funded at \$7.1 billion, which is \$1.8 billion below the request. At this funding level, the EPA will be prevented from accomplishing many of its missions to protect our environment.

There are so many destructive riders attached to this legislation that it is difficult to figure out which ones to highlight during my brief remarks. One that specifically harms my State of New York was added during full committee markup. This rider prevents the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timelines or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect. Because New York has been at the forefront of efforts to require ships to treat their ballast water before discharging it into New York's waterways, our State will be immediately affected. States should

have the right to protect their own waters from dangerous aquatic invasive species.

Another particularly harmful rider would stop the EPA from limiting greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources for a 1-year period. Overall, 69 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States come from stationary sources, such as our electric utilities and petroleum refineries. This rider, which prevents the EPA from acting, will have far reaching and devastating consequences on our Nation's air quality. In particular, my Bronx congressional district, which has one of the highest asthma rates in the Nation, will continue to suffer from poor air quality.

Because of the sharp reductions included in this bill to the programs and agencies that protect our environment, enrich our lives through the arts, and increase recreational opportunities; and because of the riders that harm our wildlife, our land, our water, and our air quality, I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2012 Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN for being excellent leaders on the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with both of them. I especially commend the 22 oversight hearings that our subcommittee held this year. The subcommittee works hard, and we have done our due diligence in putting this bill together.

The FY 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations bill recognizes the current economic environment and the past 4 years of out-of-control spending. It is \$2.1 billion below last year's level, and \$3.8 billion below the President's 2012 request. It is a focused and lean bill which supports funding for duties which are clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government and makes tough decisions about how we allocate taxpayers' dollars.

The bill fully funds Federal firefighters and Forest Service Wildland Fire Management. It ensures our national parks, which belong to the American people, remain fully operational in 2012. And it includes \$30 million for diesel emissions reduction grants to retrofit old diesel engines with cleaner burning ones, a program that has been successfully implemented across the United States and is contributing to cleaner air.

The bill also reduces the EPA inflated budget back down to the 2006 level and cuts \$46 million in requested funding for burdensome regulation of greenhouse gases, which means control of carbon dioxide, a regulation unilaterally adopted by the administration

that is making the U.S. less competitive in the world and sending American jobs overseas.

Finally, yes, Mr. Chairman, there are many spending reductions in this bill, including programs I support. However, we have to start somewhere to bring economic sanity back to the budgeting process, and this is one of the first of many steps to come.

In conclusion, I am pleased to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, I have great respect for Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN, and the staffers on both sides of the aisle.

One important aspect of this bill is Chairman SIMPSON and Representative COLE have worked together with Democrats to protect critical education and health care investments in Indian Country as part of our trust relationship with the 565 tribes in this country. Native American children, families and elders will all benefit as a result of our efforts.

However, on virtually every other aspect of this bill, particularly on the environment, this appropriations bill is a radical attempt to take America backwards from 40 years of bipartisan progress in protecting human health and our environment.

There are nearly 40 special interest policy riders in this bill. It is outrageous that these riders protect corporate polluters while attacking clean water, clean air, our public lands, and wildlife conservation. Representatives WAXMAN, MARKEY and RUSH, as ranking members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Natural Resources Committee have sent letters expressing their grave concern about these extreme, destructive policy riders that have no business being on an appropriations spending bill.

This abuse of the legislative process to further Republicans' radical agenda on behalf of polluters and special interests should not be tolerated. These policy riders put the public health of Americans at risk and will imperil America's natural heritage for future generations. In particular, Republicans have chosen to mount an unprecedented assault on the Environmental Protection Agency, an agency created by President Richard Nixon.

Clearly, Republicans have now come full circle and this bill makes House Republicans the most polluter-friendly Congress in nearly two generations. In addition to gutting EPA's budget, Republicans have added 10 policy riders that will make the air we breathe dirtier and eight policy riders that will make the water we drink more polluted and toxic. The Republican riders halt the EPA's work under the Clean Air Act to protect the public health from impacts of carbon dioxide pollution,

mercury emissions, sulfur dioxide, soot and smog. This will jeopardize the health of millions of children suffering from asthma and put more Americans at risk for strokes, heart disease, and other respiratory and cardiovascular diseases.

In 2010, the EPA found the Clean Air Act saved 160,000 lives nationwide. That's equivalent to the entire population of Tempe, Arizona. By 2020, that number is expected to grow to 230,000 lives saved, leading to \$2 trillion in economic benefits.

Republican riders also stop EPA's work under the Clean Water Act to clean our rivers, streams, lakes, and to protect our drinking water from the impacts of coal mining, storm water discharge, and toxic nutrient pollution and pesticides.

Essentially, House Republicans are telling the American people that protecting public health and the environment from corporate polluters is no longer important. And despite the Tea Party Republicans' supposed ban on earmarks, this bill is loaded with earmarks for a few privileged polluters and special interests.

□ 1440

Here are just four out of a dozen Republican earmarks contained in this bill:

An earmark for foreign companies to allow for uranium mining adjacent to the Grand Canyon, one of America's most treasured places;

An earmark for Shell Oil to ignore environmental regulations to drill offshore in the Arctic Ocean;

An earmark for a few sheep farmers subsidized by U.S. taxpayers on U.S. land so they can evade environmental laws that protect bighorn sheep;

A special earmark for the State of Texas to continue its illegal air permitting program in violation of the Clean Air Act.

These dirty, toxic, and dangerous earmarks to a few special interests come at the expense of cleaner water, healthier air, our cherished national parks, and endangered wildlife. Minnesotans are deeply troubled by this reckless bill that endangers the health of our communities while destroying our natural resources that are our children's inheritance. This is one of the most extreme pieces of anti-environmental legislation to ever come to the floor of the House. As far as the American people are concerned, H.R. 2584 should be declared a toxic Superfund site that is so dangerous to human health and the environment that it needs to be remediated rather than passed into law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and its abandonment of 40 years of progress we have made in protecting the American people's health and the American national heritage.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to an esteemed colleague and member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to praise the process by which we arrived at this. This is probably the hardest-working subcommittee on a very hard-working Appropriations Committee; 22 separate hearings, a very open process. I think even the minority that disagreed with some of the decisions that were made would agree that they were made fairly, openly, transparently, and by votes. And the American people can look at what we did.

Usually, when you come to this floor, you come to debate and to disagree. We're certainly going to have a great deal of that over the course of the next several days as we work through the main legislation and the many amendments which undoubtedly will be offered. But I want to focus today on an area of bipartisan agreement, and that's the decisions that were made regarding funding in Indian Country and Native American programs.

Mr. Chairman, our chairman generously mentioned, and appropriately mentioned, the hard work that Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS did in setting the foundation for the progress that's being built upon this year. What he was too modest about was his own role, first as a ranking member and then as the chairman, and also seeing that an appropriate focus was placed on Indian Country. Frankly, while I disagree with the administration in many places, I want to thank them as well because in many cases, they had great suggestions, they certainly put forward serious proposals, and they've been very easy to work with in Native American issues. So there's a lot of praise here to go around.

Most importantly, I think from an appropriations standpoint, the numbers speak for themselves. The Bureau of Indian Affairs funding was cut, but actually cut less than the President requested. The Indian Health Service got a 9 percent increase—almost \$400 million. You can run through the program. IHS staffing for new facilities, \$63 million. Fully funded at the President's request. Road maintenance, \$25 million. Funded at the President's request. Indian guaranteed loan program, something to help tribes as they move into private industries, actually funded above the President's request. Contract support costs, fully funded, \$228 million. Indian Health Service, fully funded, \$574 million.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman.

Contract support, again, fully funded or funded at very near what the President requested. Most importantly, language put in to make sure that those contracts are actually fully funded by the BIA, something that has not always happened in the past. Again, important language on joint ventures

whereby we encourage tribes to take some of their revenue, work with the Federal Government, reinvest in health care facilities, other needed infrastructure improvements in Indian Country.

I say all this just to point out that while we have serious disagreements and serious debates, and while we made very hard decisions, overall funding is, as Chairman SIMPSON suggested, down 7 percent from last year and certainly well below the request that the President made. In this area, defending one of the most challenged populations in the country, Republicans and Democrats alike can be exceptionally proud of what was done and the priorities when we put, again, the most challenged people that we deal with on that committee in the most favored position. That hasn't always happened. I want to thank my friend Chairman SIMPSON for making sure it happened and my friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS for doing the same.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill in its current form. Not only am I deeply troubled by the bill's lack of infrastructure investment that would create jobs, grow the economy, and protect public health, but it is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee has included several dozen egregious special interest policy earmarks in the bill that will undermine our Nation's commitment to clean water, clean air, and the environment, which are fundamental to local economies like the one I represent.

We've heard from our friends on the Appropriations Committee that we must make difficult decisions in these trying economic times. I couldn't agree more. Furthermore, we've heard from the chairman of the subcommittee that he believes that many of the programs that are cut are good programs, but that we must be willing to make cuts to reduce our growing debt.

Consider this: The bill cuts \$2.1 billion from 2011 levels for the Department of the Interior, EPA, and other agencies. However, if we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts only for those households earning more than a million dollars per year, we could save the revenues necessary to preserve these critical agencies in less than 18 days. The bill provides \$1.4 billion less for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a fund that is critical to both environmental protection and economic development. If we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts, we could reestablish our commitment to clean water within 12 days, affecting only those tax cuts from people who make a million dollars a year or more. That's a reasonable price to pay for the economic development that would result.

Over the past several months we have heard repeatedly that we must do all

that we can to prevent taxing our Nation's job creators, a sentiment with which I agree in principle. However, in my district and districts all across this country, it is the environment that is the job creator. The economy of my district depends on clean water, clean air, and safe, swimmable beaches. The cuts in this bill place all of these in jeopardy. If the Republican priorities in this bill prevail, we could put an effective tax rate of zero on the small businesses in my district and it wouldn't help at all because they would have no income—and no income means no jobs.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed former chairman of the full committee, the member emeritus of several subcommittees, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking member, especially for the number of public hearings they had reviewing all of the programs of this subcommittee, taking us back to regular order in almost unprecedented form, making sure the public had a chance to talk to us about their view as to how these programs were working.

As we meet today, the country is faced with a crisis regarding our debt. Should we raise the national debt ceiling or not? That debate is swirling around whether we should reduce spending or we should increase taxes to fund additional spending desired by the administration and the former majority. It's very, very important to know that we are at a crisis point in terms of spending. With that backdrop, we can hear the same debate taking place in this very committee discussion. People complaining about not enough money for EPA, for example.

The fact is that most of these programs are over-funded relative to just a few years ago, and the debate and the concern is an expression about a desire for more spending or a lack of increased funding above and beyond the wish list of many around here. The fundamental issue ought to be discussed in terms of how programs have worked and not worked.

I've heard many complaints about air quality questions today by the other side. It was, Mr. Chairman, my privilege to write the toughest environmental laws in the country relative to improving air quality. Years ago, as we discussed implementing those policies in my State of California, the center of the discussion was to make sure we focus upon the real problems.

□ 1450

We can solve the problems of stationary sources, we said then, very quickly, very easily—up to 97 percent-plus of their pollution. The real problem lies with the automobile, doing something serious about that. What people do driving their cars is the key to the question.

The EPA has failed us in many, many a way in dealing with these major challenges, and I would suggest that any number of issues that might be raised is illustrated by the one endangered species I'd mentioned. That endangered species is the desert tortoise.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We could have solved that problem years ago by planting endless numbers of eggs in the East Mojave. Instead, the EPA decided to ignore and the environmentalists decided to ignore that potential, saying it took too long to plant those and have them grow to adulthood. The fact is, over the last 15 years, had we done that, we would not have that endangered species any longer. Recently, we learned the only healthy population of the desert tortoise was on the National Training Center Army base where they took care of the animals versus what we did in the environment. Indeed, the EPA deserves some serious review as well as reauthorization.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), an extraordinary champion of the environment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am uncomfortable coming to the floor and having to speak against this bill. There is nobody in Congress I have more respect and affection for than the subcommittee chairman; but this bill is an example of why the Republican budget gimmick last week was a fool's errand. If ever enacted, the public would be outraged.

These critical programs of EPA are not overfunded. Just talk to anybody in your home community who is dealing with things like the revolving fund for sewer and water.

This bill is not balanced. There are opportunities where there could have been fees and charges from people who profit from the activities of this bill. But no. Instead, we are shifting costs to the public and damage to the environment. We are actually giving more money to some of the special interests that profit from these activities.

We are slashing things that matter to most Americans—the ability of the EPA to protect our families and their environment and land acquisition to protect American treasures. It's going to cost hundreds of thousands of jobs in rural and small town America where people rely on our open spaces, our public lands, our parks and recreational activities.

It shortchanges America's future.

The jihad against climate change continues from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and it's ironic. When people can barely walk outside in Washington, D.C. and when we're dealing with drought, flood, wildfires, the extreme weather events across the country, the scientists tell

us that it's related to human activity, and this budget reduces our ability to deal with climate change and extreme weather events.

I agree that the subcommittee has a very difficult job, in part, because of the unrealistic numbers that were given to them; but sadly, if you look at the bill in its entirety, I must take gentle exception to Chairman ROGERS saying we all support the core mission of EPA. Sadly, anybody who reads this bill understands that that's not the case and that it's being brought to us in a way that simply undermines that core mission that means so much to Americans, to our environment, and to our future.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the reality is that this is a bad bill. There may be some good people who have been involved in putting it together. I like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but the fact is that this would severely restrict our government's ability to improve the quality of our air and water. It would substantially cut programs that, I think, many of the American people take for granted. Our environment will be despoiled by this bill if it becomes enacted, so I would strongly urge that this body vote against it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. In closing, I thank the Members for the debate that has gone on with regard to this bill.

I notice that Members on the other side of the aisle continually refer to some of the policy provisions that are in this bill as policy rider/special interest legislation. In fact, they were called "earmark legislation" in this bill, but they are special interest.

Let me tell you that the only special interest that I care about right now are the unemployed people in this country who are looking for a job. If you talk to any business in this country, the one thing they will tell you is the uncertainty created by the potential regulation and proposed regulation by the EPA is stopping them from expanding their businesses because they have no idea—no idea—what it's going to cost to hire a new employee.

They are the biggest wet blanket on our economy that we have today, so we need to do something about it. We need to rein them back in because they are totally out of control. That's what this bill does.

This is under an open rule. That means Members will have the opportunity, if they have different ideas and if they can get a majority of the votes, to remove some of these things. If so, they can remove them, but I'd suspect more are going to be added rather than removed as this bill moves through its full consideration.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this Rule and this incredibly short-sighted legislation before us today. The underlying bill is a direct attack on the environment and as a result an assault on public health and our economy.

The programs included in the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill affect so many aspects of our lives including clean air, clean water, public health and support for the arts.

Unfortunately, at the funding level provided, the Environmental Protection Agency will be fundamentally dismantled, making the agency unable to implement its core mission of protecting the environment and promoting public health.

The bill also removes funding for programs that help modernize buildings and other infrastructure and funding for innovative projects that are helping communities implement smarter water management solutions that protect clean water and save consumers money.

In my district, the Sacramento and American Rivers provide 85 percent of drinking water to those that live in the City of Sacramento that is over 400,000 of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, we rely on federal support to ensure the water we drink is safe. Without the proper level of funding I am very worried that we are going down a path of unknown consequences.

This bill also hurts Sacramento by slashing funds for the EPA's Office of Smart Growth which has worked closely with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments to ensure sustainable, positive growth in our region. In a time when local governments are suffering massive cuts, the investment in the Office of Smart Growth offers our communities assistance that will help them grow and revitalize their local economies.

Mr. Chair, the Sacramento area is on a path to become a national leader in the green economy, with over 230 companies, and 14,000 jobs. It is critical that we support policies that foster new innovation, and job growth in the green economy. Unfortunately, this bill does not do that!

What's more, this bill would cut the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by 13 percent. Both NEA and NEH grants are essential for our local economies. This funding is fundamental to supporting a thriving arts scene in my district, creating jobs and inspiring local students. As a former docent of the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, I can tell you firsthand the effect that an individual piece of art or a trip to a museum can have on a child. These are cuts we cannot afford to make.

In previous years, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill has provided an opportunity to move our nation forward and make progress in areas as diverse as climate change to water use efficiency. But in this Congress, this Majority is forcing us to take a huge step backwards.

As a whole, this legislation has an unprecedented number of special-interest policy riders that endanger public health and go beyond the scope of the legislation.

In an austere budget environment, we can all agree that cuts need to be made but cuts to public health, cannot and should not be made just to give subsidies to Big Oil and Wall Street Executives.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the dangerous and unprecedented ramifications this bill would have

on our constituents. I strongly reject this egregious proposal.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 363 is adopted. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a manager's amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the amendment en bloc and at this point in the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 3, insert "all" before "funds".

Page 48, line 5, strike "exhausted" and insert "obligated".

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,812,000)".

Page 81, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

Page 105, line 19, insert "to the National Endowment for the Humanities" after "available".

Page 125, lines 14 and 15, strike "may establish" and "programs".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. The manager's amendment before us makes several technical and conforming changes to the bill. These are all noncontroversial changes, and they have been shared with the minority. I believe the minority is supportive of the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLAY. I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member MORAN, for your leadership and for this opportunity to discuss an important and urgent matter.

As the chairman knows, there are two acts that seek to conserve marine mammals—the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. I am not here to debate the merits of those acts but to discuss an inadvertent and unexpected consequence of them.

□ 1500

There is what seems to be a contradiction when it comes to the protection of polar bears. Exactly the opposite may be happening.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

I am aware of this issue. This is one of those times when a law whose intent is to protect may be unintentionally causing harm.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, you are correct. This is an urgent issue, as we know, of polar bears, specific bears today that are in danger of being lost and which could be saved by importation into the United States. While it was the intent of Congress to protect these animals, the acts were never intended to be bureaucratic obstacles to common sense and to saving their lives.

Some brief background is in order. Mr. Chairman, section 101 of the Marine Mammals Protection Act established a moratorium on the importation of marine mammals. However, section 102 and 104 of the act allow for the issuance of permits for the importation of marine mammals under certain circumstances.

Now, the act generally prohibits permits from public display of marine mammals from a species of stock designated as depleted, which is defined as one that is listed as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

On May 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Interior listed the polar bear as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act; and since then, no permits for the importation of polar bears for the health and welfare of the animals or for the purposes of public display have been issued by the Secretary. The act does require that conservation plans for taking animals include proposals to enhance their habitat which, in this case, is impossible.

One of the main reasons the polar bear was listed as threatened is the loss of their habitat. It is not possible

to comply with this requirement, and we urge the Secretary to take this into consideration when making a final determination on these permits.

There is also a requirement that such takings be for scientific purposes. Mr. Chairman, I think you would agree that establishing successful captive breeding programs for a threatened species fits into the Congress's intent for scientific purposes. Declining habitat conditions for the polar bear and an increasing number of human-bear interaction have resulted in an increase in the number of polar bears brought into temporary or permanent captivity in Canada in recent years, including an increase in the number of non-releasable animals and orphaned cubs.

Canadian institutions cannot house all of these bears and any animals not placed in suitable facilities could be used, euthanized or left to die in the wild.

The Government of Manitoba, Canada, has passed legislation allowing such bears to be exported from Canada for purposes of captive maintenance and public display at accredited zoological institutions in the United States. These are institutions that have undergone a thorough and rigorous review and inspection process by zoological professionals to examine all aspects of an institution's operation.

Prior to issuing those permits, the Secretary of the Interior should determine the institution is accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and meets specific public display criteria as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify that it is your understanding that under these acts, the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the U.S. of live polar bears for the purpose of public display at appropriate accredited zoological institutions. Upon a finding that such importation of such will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bears, in addition with the other areas, the Secretary's authority is granted under the Marine Mammals Protection Act, section 102(b) and 104(c)(4)(A).

Again, I want to thank the chairman for this opportunity.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLAY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to be clear. I hope the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service hear us clearly when we say that it is the sense of the committee that under these acts the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the United States of live polar bears for the purposes of public display

at appropriate accredited zoological institutions upon a finding that such importation will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bear.

I thank the gentleman for raising the matter and for working with me on this important issue.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the chairman, as well as Ranking Member DICKS for requesting additional time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau and the assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$918,227,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2012 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$18,663,000)”.

Page 92, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$18,663,000)”.

Mr. MORAN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, as I noted previously, there are a lot of winners and losers in H.R. 2584.

Two of the winners are the oil and gas companies and the cattle grazers who use our publicly owned land. One of the losers is Indians who need Sanitation Facilities.

My amendment would do two things. First, it decreases funding from the increase in the bill for the BLM's oil and gas and grazing management programs. Second, the amendment would restore the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program by what it was cut below the current spending level. I find it ironic that the majority refused to allow the administration to collect an inspection

fee from the oil and gas industry but had no problem in providing more taxpayer subsidies for the oil and gas industry.

The oil and gas industry gets about \$4 billion in subsidies per year. Likewise cattle ranchers get about \$400 million in subsidies per year by paying their ridiculously low fee of \$1.35 per month per cow while States charge so much more. Texas, for example, charges \$65 to \$150 per cow per month to graze on State-owned lands, but the Federal Government charges only \$1.35. Well, in this bill, they would see an increase in taxpayer resources devoted to grazing management from \$75 million to \$90 million, a 20 percent increase. Why not ask them to at least pay the cost of administering their grazing subsidy?

If our national budget is truly about shared sacrifice, how about starting with the oil and gas companies that have profited so handsomely from the resources owned by the American public and from ranchers whose use of the public lands is heavily subsidized by the American taxpayer.

The second part of my amendment provides an additional \$18.6 million for the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program. It would simply restore funding to last year's level.

At the end of fiscal year 2010, there were about 230,000 Native American homes in need of sanitation facilities including 34,000 homes without running water. According to the Indian Health Service, Native Americans in these homes are at extremely high risk for gastrointestinal disease and respiratory disease at rates similar to Third World countries. Additionally, the Indian Health Service has noted that many of these homes without services are very remote with limited access to health care, which increases the importance of improving environmental conditions in these homes.

The least we can do is to provide the same level of funding that was provided this current year to the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program, which is an integral component of the Indian Health Services disease prevention activities.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, the chairman suggested that there were no special interests. Well, this disproves that. There are special interests. Oil and gas companies already getting subsidies from the American taxpayer of about \$4 billion a year, they get increases in this bill. We're simply asking them to pay a little more towards the Federal Government's cost of managing the fees that they should be paying.

□ 1510

Just a little bit more, we're asking them to pay. And we're also asking the ranchers who, again, get special interest subsidies of about \$400 million in this bill, more money for the ranchers, more subsidy, more subsidy for the oil and gas companies; and yet at the same time, we cut the money that would

provide sanitation facilities for 230,000 Native American homes in need, and 34,000 of those homes are without even potable water. They are the losers. Oil and gas companies and the grazers are the winners in this bill. That's why I would urge support for the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia.

Honoring our Nation's obligations to American Indians and Alaskan Natives is an unshakable bipartisan sentiment shared by Members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and is an accomplishment in this bill that I am most proud of. This bill increases funding for Indian Health Services by \$392 million over the current fiscal year while almost virtually everything else is being cut, a 10 percent increase that also happens to be one of the rare and, by far, the largest increases in this bill. This bill includes the same \$19 billion cut for sanitation facilities that was proposed by the President. And I note that the President's Indian Health Service budget was an additional \$162 million higher than this bill.

The problem is the offset. The BLM's management of land resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY 2011 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account are not appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, am I proud of the increases we were able to provide in this bill and in previous bills by my predecessors Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS? You bet I am. Will I continue to fight for more funding for Indian country despite the attacks from virtually every other interest group who isn't happy with their share of the pie? You bet I will. Will I stand by and let my friend and colleague from Virginia continue to systematically dismantle the budget of the largest landowner in the West, the BLM? Absolutely not. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. I support my friend from Virginia's (Mr. MORAN) amendment which would increase funding for the Indian Health Service sanitary facilities construction program. The amendment would provide \$18 million for this important health program, which would bring the funding level back up

to the enacted level for this year. The offset for this increase comes from a couple of programs that help support the private sector energy and livestock industries.

I think this amendment is a very good deal for the American taxpayer. And, by the way, if you've ever been out in Indian country, one of the problems that they have is a lack of sanitary facilities. I can think of the Skokomish Indians in my district in Mason County, Washington, where they have a very serious need for new sanitary facilities. And across Indian country, this is still a major problem. In fact, there was a group of scientists a few years ago who were asked, What was the greatest thing that happened in the 20th century to improve health care? They came up with sewers and sanitary facilities as the thing that improved health care around the world the most substantially.

The Indian Health Service program to construct sanitary facilities that would benefit from this amendment improves the lives of some of our poorest fellow citizens. The Indian Health Service program provides funding for people who often lack basic sanitary facilities, such as the delivery of potable water to their homes. For me, the choice is simple. I urge my colleagues to choose to help provide basic sanitation to Native Americans by making small cuts to programs that assist the energy and livestock industries. This is a good amendment and should be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to also support the Moran amendment for providing more access to clean drinking water.

And to Chairman SIMPSON's point, we did do a good job working together to significantly improve the quality of life in Indian country, and we did that working together. But one area in which some of us felt we could have done a little better is in the area of Indian sanitation. We're seeking to put the funding level back to where this Chamber had it in FY 2011, not a cut. And the way that we're asking to do that—and I will speak to the issue of grazing because I offered the amendment in the full Appropriations Committee—is to ask cattle ranchers to pay a fair fee to graze their cattle. A fee of \$1.35, as Mr. MORAN pointed out, is less than what most States are charging for the use of their public lands. And it is significantly less, as I found in some information gathering that I did, than the private sector charges for the use of their lands.

When we have our lands at \$1.35, not only is it not of benefit to the taxpayers, but it leads to overgrazing of our lands, which does nothing to help improve the quality of public lands for

future generations of cattle ranchers. Fifteen million dollars to grazers in this bill, \$4 million to oil and gas. And the numbers again: 230,000 Native American homes without sanitation facilities; 34,000 homes without clean, safe drinking water.

No infant and no child in this country or in Indian country should be at risk of gastrointestinal disease rates that are found in Third World countries. Let us provide the same level of funding that we had in the FY 2011 bill for Indian sanitation. Let us support clean drinking water for our children.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$70,000,000)”.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$85,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,804,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 10, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$120,000)”.

Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 39, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$47,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$900,000,000)”.

Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$771,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$344,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$427,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$78,000,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 88, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$432,000,000)”.

Page 96, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 103, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$125,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,231,000)”.

Mr. HUELSKAMP (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Today I rise on behalf of the Republican Study Committee to offer an amendment to bring the Interior appropriations bill in line with the RSC budget.

Mr. Chairman, credit rating agencies around the country are threatening to downgrade our debt, and not because we won't pass a debt ceiling increase but more so because we have not passed a credible plan to pay that debt back. Every child born in America today owes the Federal Government over \$46,000, and that bill rises every day.

The times we are in demand that we look at the effectiveness of every Federal dollar we spend, and that is why I offer this amendment today. This amendment makes cuts across the bill, but the biggest cuts come from the EPA. In my opinion, no agency in our Federal Government has done more to negatively impact our economy than the EPA.

In my district in western Kansas, EPA foot-dragging and redtape is delaying the construction of a new power plant. The construction of the plant would create 1,900 construction jobs and 261 permanent jobs, yet they cannot even break ground. Region VII is asking for changes. Environmental groups continue to file lawsuits based on EPA rules, exacting a death-by-litigation strategy against the rural electric cooperative members seeking to build this plant.

□ 1520

According to a study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 351 proposed solar, wind, wave, biofuel, coal, gas, nuclear and energy transmission projects have been delayed or canceled due to significant impediments, such as regulatory barriers, including inefficient review processes and the attendant lawsuits and threats of legal action.

The study found that these projects would produce 1.9 million new jobs during construction and almost 800,000 jobs on an ongoing basis. These jobs are simply in limbo when our economy sorely needs them. In fact, not a week seems to go by without the EPA issuing a new rule or regulation that increases costs to businesses and consumers. BoilerMACT, water cooling intakes for power plants, interstate air

quality, dust and other particulate matter, ozone, and the list goes on and on.

These actions not only drive up costs but they create higher degrees of uncertainty in our fragile economy. And when the EPA isn't hampering our economy at home, they are sending our tax dollars abroad. Nearly \$1.3 million was sent to China in grants over the past 2 years. Yes, that's right, these grants were sent to the China Coal Institute, the China University of Petroleum, the China Urban Construction Design and Research Academy, and the China Association of Rural Energy Industry. I guess the hundreds of billions of dollars of debt we owe them is not enough.

The EPA has long given up sound scientific methods to ensure a clean environment for a left-wing agenda that heaps billions in costs on our economy in exchange for nearly immeasurable incremental changes in our water and air quality.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also zeroes out funding for the NEA and the NEH. Federal spending on the arts and humanities has long been controversial, not only for the nature of some of the grants but also for the fact that I believe the Federal Government should not play such a role in our society and certainly should not at a time when we are facing an impending debt crisis. If we cannot make relatively easy decisions to eliminate this funding, how can the American people expect us to make the harder decisions necessary to balance our Federal budget?

Mr. Chairman, the amendment also ends funding for National Heritage Area grants. This provision was included as a result of the YouCut program where the American people could vote on a government program to cut, and this is the one they selected. Federal funding for heritage areas was supposed to be seed capital to get them up and running for the States, localities, and private sector who requested them. Many of the grants have exceeded their original 10-year limitation. Even the President recommended a 50 percent cut in his budget for them, which was included in the bill; but in this time of much needed Federal spending restraint, it is time to cut them altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to pass this amendment and help put us on a track to balance our budget in the next decade.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts every environmental, conservation, and cultural program across the bill, totaling \$3 billion in cuts, and then puts those funds in the spending reduction account.

The funding in the bill is already grossly inadequate, and this amendment would cut the bill by more than

10 percent. The amendment zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife construction by cutting \$12 million. It zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife land acquisition by cutting \$15 million. It zeroes out Forest Service land acquisition. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Arts. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Humanities. It cuts State and local water infrastructure by \$770 million, 30 percent, even though the infrastructure needs across this country, as Mr. Dicks has stated, is \$688 billion.

This amendment goes on to cut the National Park Service, the Office of the Secretary, Wildland Fire Management, EPA Science and Technology, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, we should all oppose these draconian cuts. They don't make sense. I don't think the gentleman proposing them necessarily knows what the full impact would be. I suspect, though, that if his constituents, let alone the American people, knew what was being attempted, they would agree with me that this amendment should be soundly defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join with my good friend from Virginia in speaking against this amendment, although I do appreciate my friend from Kansas in offering it, because this is precisely what would be required if the budget gimmick that was offered by the Republicans last week to restrict funding to 1966 levels, a budget level that was never met by Ronald Reagan, who never proposed a budget that was less than 21 percent, but this is exactly what would be required. It's why the House is going to demonstrate the schizophrenia on the part of my friends on the other side of the aisle, because this amendment is going to be rejected, I predict. It will be rejected, even though that is what they would wish on the American public.

Zeroing out the resources for the National Humanities, for the NEA, things that, when push comes to shove, the American public embraces, supports, have dramatic economic impact at home, that leverage private dollars, but this is just the tip of the iceberg. I appreciate it being offered. I wish that people would look at it closely because this is what is being proposed by our Republican friends in their effort going forward.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I will yield back, but I do hope people pay close attention to what is embodied here, because this is a taste of what people have in store for the American public.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and while I appreciate my good friend from Kansas's passion for cutting spending, the reality is that this is exactly what we're doing. This bill comes in under the allocation. We passed the budget earlier this year on the floor—we're the only body to have passed a budget, actually. The Senate has not passed one yet. We were given an allocation, and this bill comes in under that allocation.

We all know that we cannot balance this budget simply by cutting, but we also know that reducing Federal spending is a necessary priority and a first step toward getting us toward a balanced budget.

I think that this amendment goes too far. It would take \$3 billion from the numerous accounts in this bill, including the BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, NEA and NEH, as was mentioned, and transfer it to the budget reduction account.

While I appreciate the gentleman's concern that he expressed about the impact that the EPA is having in this country on job creation, and I have said repeatedly that when I go out and give a speech somewhere to a chamber of commerce or Lions Club or whatever, I'll talk about the Interior bill and the agencies that we fund, and when I get to the EPA, someone in the audience will say, Just defund it, get rid of it, and it's the first applause line in the speech. That's the reputation the EPA has out in the public, and that's the concern that the public has about the direction that the EPA is headed.

So I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the EPA; but as I try to explain to people, you can't just do away with the EPA because if you're out there and you have a business and the underlying law requires you to get an air quality permit or a water permit or something like that and you call the EPA to get your air quality permit and no one's there to answer the phone, to help you with that, then you've got a problem. We don't want to eliminate the EPA. What we want to do is rein the EPA back in, because I think they've got an overly aggressive agenda; and, as I have said, I think they're the biggest wet blanket on the growth in our economy that there is.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I would hope that my colleagues would oppose the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I move to strike the last word to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, what the American people want from their leaders in Washington can be summed up in a single word: jobs, J-O-B-S. The Republicans have now controlled the House for more than 200 days, and they haven't lifted a finger to address the single overriding priority of the people we work for, that is, jobs.

□ 1530

It's a gross failure of leadership.

Instead, what's on their agenda this week? Only the biggest assault on environmental protections in several decades.

I have yet, Mr. Chairman, to see a poll where Americans are clamoring for the Congress to undermine pollution controls, damage public health, and unravel a 40-year bipartisan conservation consensus. I can't think of a single environmental program or initiative that is spared under the base legislation, and this amendment makes it even worse.

The base bill would mean more toxic mercury, arsenic and soot pollution released in our air. It leaves the area surrounding the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon, an iconic national park, open to toxic uranium mining.

It cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 78 percent. It tears the heart out of the Clean Water Act, and it guts the Endangered Species Act. And it removes those pesky regulatory obstacles that keep pesticides out of our waterways.

The Republicans want to block EPA's efforts to protect communities from stormwater runoff and to issue new energy-efficiency standards for new vehicles after 2016. Everything we've put in place that makes sense is what they want to get rid of.

And on and on and on and on it goes, Mr. Chairman, one extreme policy rider after another. None of this will do anything to save taxpayers money. It is an absolute frontal assault on the water we drink, the air we breathe, the public lands we cherish.

This is a big special interest giveaway, and that is simple. It's a classic example of legislating to benefit friends and benefactors, Big Oil and other corporate polluters at the expense of national interests. The Nation's natural resources are not ours to exploit at our will. They are on loan to us. We must be the responsible stewards.

It will be a moral failure if we don't pass an improved environmental bill, and if we don't pass an environment on to the next generation, one that is in even better condition than the one we have today.

But that's what this disgraceful legislation would do. It breaks a covenant that the American people take very seriously, a covenant they actually take for granted. It's Republican extremism run amok on steroids, voraciously rampaging out of control.

The base bill, H.R. 2584, must be stopped. This amendment cannot see the light of day. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend Chairman SIMPSON for opposing this

amendment. This is an amendment that goes way too far. This bill is \$3.8 billion, almost \$4 billion below what the President requested. It's \$2 billion below the FY11 level, which we just passed a few months ago, and it would have a devastating effect on our environment.

When I hear people talk about growing the economy by cutting the budget, I wonder what school of economics they attended. In fact, there was an outstanding article just a few weeks ago in *The New York Times* that really laid out the basic problem we have in this economy, and that is that consumer spending has dropped by 7 percent. Normally, in previous recessions, it only went down 3 percent.

So then when you cut State and local government funding, when you cut Federal funding, you make a bad situation worse in terms of consumption. And that is why the economy has slowed down, and that's why it's not going to go up as a result of these kinds of reckless cuts being offered by the other side.

Let me give you one example. The former EPA administrator, Christine Todd Whitman, from New Jersey, did a study of what the backlog on wastewater treatment facilities was. And it was \$688 billion, and this was in 2002. It's definitely gone up.

And yet we're slashing, and would slash again, the amount of money for the Clean Water Revolving Fund and the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund and the State and Tribal Assistance Grants. Those are exactly the programs that we should be plussing up in order to get people back to work. It's infrastructure. That's one thing we used to be able to agree on, both Democrats and Republicans in this House, that we need infrastructure work. This will put people to work.

How are you going to get the deficit down? Not by slashing government spending. You're going to get it by putting people back to work. When you put them back to work, they start paying taxes, they start buying goods, and that will drive down the deficit. It will drive down unemployment.

This reckless amendment from the gentleman from Kansas, again, would make this bad situation even worse in terms of job creation. So I am pleased that the majority is resisting this ill-thought-out amendment, and I urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in the committee report for this bill, the appropriations committee included some language expressing concerns in regard to the Environmental Protection Agency's Urban Waters Initiative and provides no funding in the bill for this program for fiscal year 2012.

I understand the committee's reluctance to extend funding for new broad, cross-cutting initiatives, given our economic situation. However, I feel this initiative has immense value to millions of people who live in urban centers and who rely on the government to ensure that they have clean water to drink and use in their daily lives. This amendment would restore partial funding for the Urban Waters Initiative for fiscal year 2012. This amendment does not increase the spending by one single penny.

Cities share one key characteristic: they're full of people, buildings, and businesses. Because everyone shares the same relative space, air and water environmental impacts are concentrated in smaller areas, including waterways. Urban waters take on large amounts of pollution from a variety of sources, including industrial discharges, mobile sources, such as cars and trucks, residential/commercial wastewater, trash and polluted stormwater runoff from urban landscapes. As urban populations often share centralized water sources, this pollution creates public and environmental health hazards like lowered drinking water quality and water bodies that aren't safe for human swimming.

The EPA launched the Urban Waters Program to address water quality challenges in the urban watersheds and build capacity of disadvantaged communities through projects that revitalize these watersheds. If maintained properly, urban waters can also yield positive impacts for populations in both urban and upstream communities. Revitalization of waterways can spur employment and the growth of local businesses and promote improvements in housing, safety, and quality of life in these areas.

□ 1540

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REICHERT). The gentleman will suspend.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today,

the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CLEAVER. Communities across the country are coming together, working with the EPA, State and local agencies, and taking steps to access, restore, and benefit from their urban waters and the surrounding lands. My Missouri 5 District, a large section of which is Kansas City, is one such community. The EPA regional staff are working with Kansas City and local citizen groups to monitor water supply and plan and conduct improvements to the Blue River watershed and Brush Creek.

Covering 270 square miles, the Blue River compromises the largest watershed in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. Its drainage is divided between the States of Kansas and Missouri and flows through three counties, 12 cities, and 10 school districts. Brush Creek is the most visible tributary to the Blue River and runs completely through an area that we are trying to rebuild called the Green Impact Zone. The EPA is monitoring water quality along the watershed and assisting in local efforts to conduct large-scale watershed planning for Brush Creek and the Blue River.

Whether as a part of a cleanup leading to waterfront development or putting monitoring in place to ensure safe drinking water with the EPA's help, community groups across the country have taken the initiative, engaging volunteers, community organizations, and local and State government to make their waters safe for many uses.

This amendment provides \$3 million for urban waters within the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management account, though it is by no means the maximum amount of funds that this program could utilize. It will ensure that this vital, community-driven initiative can continue, and I ask for the approval of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment would take \$3 million from the BLM Management of Lands and Resources and transfer it to the EPA's Urban Waters Initiative. The BLM Management of Lands and Resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY11 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account would not be appropriate.

We eliminated funding for the EPA's new Urban Waters Initiative because it

was duplicative funding. Regardless of whether a water body is in an urban or a rural area, EPA and States should be addressing the most impaired waters first, and there are a number of well-established programs that handle that. There is no need for a separate, duplicative initiative in order to protect our urban waters; it only results in duplicative spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Mr. CLEAVER's amendment would add a modest \$3 million to the Environmental Protection Agency for the Urban Waters Initiative, which the subcommittee refused to fund.

EPA and the Department of the Interior announced the first pilot demonstrations of this program last month. They included Baltimore's Patapsco watershed, the Anacostia watershed in the District of Columbia and Maryland, the Bronx and Harlem River watersheds in New York, the South Platte River in Denver, the Los Angeles River watershed, the Lake Pontchartrain area in New Orleans, and the northwest Indiana area, all areas in drastic need of attention.

The subcommittee report chides EPA for reprioritizing funds to begin the program in fiscal year 2011 without the express approval of the committee. But my friends on the other side should know that when you fund the government under a continuing resolution, the agency has more flexibility. If we don't want EPA or any other agency to decide how to prioritize funding, then we should pass real bills. And, frankly, they did exactly the right thing in moving forward with this Urban Waters Initiative—that's where the need is.

Furthermore, denying funds to urban watersheds—where a majority of our population lives—because of a dislike for all things EPA does is simply unfair to these urban communities.

On a bipartisan basis, we have worked together to provide needed funding for rural water programs. We agree that should be a priority, but we should also show the same level of commitment for the Urban Waters Initiative.

This program will also capitalize on work being done through EPA's broader geographic programs, such as Chesapeake Bay and Lake Pontchartrain. These are two very critical water bodies that are endangered. I don't think I need to get into the extent of the endangerment for Chesapeake Bay and certainly not Lake Pontchartrain. Imagine, just think back to what happened in New Orleans just a few years ago. This offset is from the management account of the Bureau of Land

Management, which is adequately funded in the bill.

So I really do support this amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington State.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I support this amendment.

I can think back to when I was going to the University of Washington, when Lake Washington, which is between Seattle and Bellevue, was completely polluted and you couldn't swim in it. The people there bonded themselves and completely restored the lake. Today, that is some of the most valuable property in the entire Pacific Northwest.

So these urban water initiatives are critically important for the environment and for the health of the people of those areas.

I think this is a modest amendment, and I urge our colleagues to accept it.

Mr. MORAN. I very much thank the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, it is true that no bill is perfect, but this bill is truly atrocious. I have come here as co-chair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition to talk about how this bill represents a wholesale failure to really recognize our stewardship responsibilities of the greatness of this country. And it is a great country. I fly across it every Monday and Friday, and the words of the song that God's grace was shed on thee in this country are really true. But this bill shows nothing but disdain for the precious assets of clean air, clean water, and good open ground that we have in this country.

I'm sad to say that when you look out across America today you will see Republicans and Democrats out recreating—they understand what a beautiful playground we have in our national lands and clean water—but right now all this bill is is a playground for the special interests. And it's sad to say that a party that we have worked

with historically has now turned its back on its stewardship responsibility. Teddy Roosevelt, who started this effort, would be rolling over in his grave to see this wholesale abandonment of this stewardship responsibility of this great country.

Republicans and Democrats alike want more clean air; this bill gives them less. They want more clean water; this bill gives them less. They want more open good ground; this bill gives them less. And the reason is is that it's based on a huge, mistaken belief that dirty air is good for our economy, that dirty water is good for our economy, and that despoiled land is good for our economy. These are falsehoods.

You want to talk about job creation, I'd like to talk about some jobs we would like to create and keep that are damaged by this bill. Right now in Puget Sound out in Washington State, we have historically grown some of the best oysters in the world in Hood Canal and other places. And now, because of water pollution, the oyster industry that employs thousands of people in my State is endangered by water pollution.

□ 1550

Now, one would think, when we're trying to protect jobs in every industry, including the oyster industry, we might be interested in preventing pollution that destroys a whole industry. But no, that's not what this bill does. This bill weakens our ability to protect against dirty water and storm water pollution that is endangering jobs in my State and other places in this Nation. Now, if you go to talk to people in this industry, they'll say their jobs are important. But according to this bill, they are not. What's important are the special interests and the ability to degrade our environmental protection.

Take a look at the alternative fuels industry that is now growing across this country and its ability to create millions of new jobs. A few weeks ago, I was at a company called Targeted Growth. Targeted Growth had an idea a few years ago of creating biofuels that we could fly airplanes with. Five years ago, people thought this was a pipe dream. But because of their intellectual prowess, just a few weeks ago, using Targeted Growth biofuels, we flew the first transoceanic flight using biofuels from camelina that can be grown in my State and refined in my State, the first time in American history. That's something to be proud of.

Now, one would think in a bill like this, we would help new job-creating industries like that get started. But no. What this bill does is degrade the clean energy parts of our law that would give inspiration and additional innovation and investment in these clean energy industries.

This bill is an anti-job creation bill because it makes the assumption that dirty air and sick people are good for

economic growth, and that is not a recipe for economic growth in this country.

Now I'll just talk about one thing. There has been an 80 percent reduction in our Land and Conservation Water Fund, which is very disturbing, and it should be to Democrats and Republicans alike. This is one thing I hope we can fix in this bill, and it is not something that is so urban or rural. I think about this little city park in Mossy Rock, Washington. A police officer said, Why do I get all of these kids hanging around the bars? Let's get them in something. Let's get them off the streets. Using some of these funds, we now have a city park being built in Mossy Rock, Washington. Is that such a dangerous thing for our economy?

I hope the Bass amendment is successful later on so we can at least fix one thing in this bill. Otherwise, reject this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I take modest exception to the comments of my good friend from the State of Washington because, having read "Wilderness Warrior" about Teddy Roosevelt, there is no doubt that T.R. is spinning in his grave.

This Interior Environment appropriations bill represents an abdication of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government. Not only does the bill cut funding for clean air, clean water, and protection of public lands, it is polluted with anti-environmental riders. These riders have nothing to do with reducing the deficit and everything to do with undermining the role of the Federal Government in protecting our Nation's environment and public health.

This is a partisan attack on 40 years of progress to protect our health and environment. It places profit-seeking interests of large polluters over the health of the American public, privatizing the benefits while forcing the children and elderly to bear increased health care costs.

Most of all, this bill is a waste of time. In the midst of a looming debt crisis, we are engaged in a rhetorical debate about legislation that moves us backward and will never become law, either defeated in the Senate or vetoed by the President.

Republicans are risking the stability of our economy for the opportunity to demonstrate once again they are more concerned in protecting industry profits than the American people.

In the midst of a heat wave in Washington, D.C., and around the country, the bill pretends that climate change isn't happening, and even prevents the EPA from following the law and a Supreme Court decision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It threatens 2 million jobs and over \$363 billion of the Nation's economy that depends on the

support of the programs of the Department of the Interior.

There are devastating cuts to clean water and the State revolving funds. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, as is referenced, an 80 percent cut, the most dramatic reduction in 45 years. It cuts EPA's operating budget, oversight budget for offshore drilling, and will leave communities around the country struggling to provide services to their citizens and even comply with Federal laws.

In Oregon, the cuts to public lands funding will mean missed opportunities to protect special places like the Columbia River Gorge.

It will also cripple local economies. Studies have shown that for every billion dollars invested in water infrastructure, between 20,000 and 26,000 jobs are created. It cuts almost a billion dollars from the State revolving fund that helps States finance federally mandated upgrades in repairs to water and sewer systems. It will put additional pressure on already tight local budgets, as well as potentially increasing water and sewer rates. And in communities like mine, we've seen them skyrocket in recent years.

The bill rolls back lifesaving and cost-saving measures under the Clean Air Act and other environmental laws which were enacted to protect the health and environment of the American people. It should be no surprise that it is cheaper and easier to prevent toxics like mercury and arsenic from going into our air and water in the first place than trying to remove them later. The EPA studies show that the benefits far outweigh the costs.

There is no doubt why a number of public health organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics have all written to Congress opposing these clean air policy riders.

The policy riders in the spending bill can only be described as fulfilling a special interest wish list. From blocking clean air regulations and oversight of mining to preventing Federal action to clarify the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act and to a new moratorium on listings in the Endangered Species Act, the bill countless times ignores the needs of our communities and instead implements what polluting industries have been asking for. Why are we talking about allowing new mining around the Grand Canyon?

Finally, most paradoxically, this bill restricts the funding for the EPA Office of Sustainable Communities. This is an office that provides technical assistance and guidance to local communities that wish to plan for increased economic growth and development, and account for the changes in their community and demographic impacts. This office has been in existence for over 15 years. It is an extraordinarily useful tool to help communities understand how to put the pieces together, how to coax out more value. The demand is so

high for their services, they can only help 9 percent of the applicants. Now would not be the time, it would seem, to make it harder for communities who want to encourage economic development and growth in a thoughtful and sustainable fashion.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. We can and must do better for our communities.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, during our full committee markup on the Interior bill, Congressman LATOURETTE offered an amendment to prevent the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timelines or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect.

At the time, Mr. Chairman, I asked that we look more thoughtfully at the potential impact this amendment might have.

Since that markup, I have heard concerns from numerous groups and the State of New York. In addition, it is my understanding that both EPA and the Coast Guard are working towards finalizing national standards. Would you be willing as we move toward conference with the Senate to work with the New York Members, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to help us find a workable solution to this problem of invasive species and ballast water discharges?

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his question.

The gentleman from New York has spoken to me about these concerns, and I am aware that this is a serious issue that will have an immediate impact on the State of New York and other Great Lakes States. Before conference, I will work with you, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to try to resolve these concerns.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the reasoned and balanced approach he has taken to this. Rather than filing a knee-jerk reaction either in committee or now on the floor, he has recommitted to working together to solve this problem.

□ 1600

It's a problem that needs to be solved. And I just want the record to be clear: In 2008, the New York Department of Environmental Conservation—not the State legislature, not the State—enacted ballast water exchange

regulations that would have gone into effect, had they pushed the issue, that are 100 times more stringent than the international standard and would have gone to 1,000 times more stringent a year after that. Only two States, New York and Minnesota, had something in their regulations called “innocent passage,” and that is it applies to all ships that pass through New York’s water, whether they take on ballast water or discharge ballast water or whatever.

I take a backseat to no one in this Congress on the issue of invasive species in the Great Lakes. My first piece of legislation I wrote was with Senator John Glenn, the Invasive Species legislation, in 1996. But this particular provision by the New York Port Authority would cripple and perhaps eliminate commerce on the Great Lakes.

So this deserves thoughtful consideration. It deserves our study. And I would again commit to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to work with you and the chairman to find a way that solves this horrible problem of invasive species in ballast water or anything else but doesn’t stop interstate commerce on the Great Lakes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I hope the press and the American people are paying attention to what’s going on on the House floor. I know the news is all about raising the debt ceiling and all the cuts or revenues that might be involved before we can get legislation to do something that has been routinely done—almost automatically done—every year or two for decades.

What is happening on the House floor deserves the attention of the American people. This is the most antienvironmental House of Representatives in history. The new Republican majority seems intent on restoring the robber-baron era where there were no controls on pollution from power plants, oil refineries, and factories.

This year, we’ve witnessed weather disaster after weather disaster. There have been massive floods, record-breaking fires, record-breaking droughts, and now record-breaking heat waves. Yet earlier this year, the House passed a bill that repealed EPA’s scientific finding that climate change is occurring, is caused by man, and is a serious threat. We don’t hear about the connection between these weather events and climate change and carbon emissions. We’re not hearing about it when we watch the daily news shows and we’re not hearing about it from this administration.

I just sent, recently, a letter to Secretary Chu, the Secretary of Energy, a Nobel Prize winner, asking him to speak out. We need to educate the

American people so we can educate our colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

In this bill, the Republican majority wants to block EPA from issuing regulations to reduce carbon emissions from power plants and oil refineries that are causing this catastrophic climate change. The majority also wants to block regulations to cut carbon pollution from motor vehicles, even though these regulations help break our dangerous dependence on oil, save American families money, and clean the air we breathe.

This House can deny science, we can amend our Nation’s laws, but we cannot rewrite the laws of nature. The longer we ignore the scientific reality that our actions are destabilizing the environment, destabilizing our climate, the more costly and disruptive our response will need to be—and the more we endanger our children’s future.

When we were debating carbon regulations earlier this year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claimed that they supported reductions in what they call “real” air pollution, whatever that means. But it turns out they’re gutting those protections as well. This legislation includes provisions that will block landmark rules to protect the health of our children by cutting air pollution and reducing toxic mercury pollution.

The bill blocks the Cross-State Air Pollution rule—an important rule that is designed to prevent dirty power plants in one State from contributing to air quality problems in other downwind States. EPA estimates that this rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths and nearly 2 million sick days a year beginning in 2014.

The bill indefinitely delays mercury and air toxics standards from power plants. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin that damages brain development in infants and children, impairing their ability to think and learn. EPA’s mercury rule will clean up this pollution and prevent 17,000 premature deaths each year.

Republicans like to argue that environmental regulations must be justified by a rigorous cost-benefit analysis. Well, these regulations have been thoroughly analyzed and their benefits are 10 times greater than their cost, yet they want to stop those regulations from going into place.

These essential health protections are not being targeted because they are too costly. They are being targeted because they are opposed by powerful special interests like oil companies and electric utilities. We need to stop putting the special interests ahead of the public interest.

This bill poses a choice: Are we for protecting pregnant women, infants, and children from toxic pollution or are we for protecting the profits of special interests? A strong and vital EPA is in our national interest and the public interest. If we disarm EPA—as this

bill would do—there is no one to stand up to the polluters and protect American families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. CHU. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today in strong opposition to the 2012 Interior appropriations bill, the most anti-environment bill I’ve seen on the House floor since I was elected to Congress.

If this bill passes, our air will be more polluted, our water will be dirtier, and we will know that much of what we love will disappear. This bill rolls back the clock to a time when big companies could poison our streams and rivers with impunity, when power plants could freely contaminate the air we breathe, and when our national treasures were destroyed by corporations, all for a bigger profit.

First, the bill slashes funding to the EPA by \$1.8 billion, stealing funding that keeps our drinking water and wastewater systems clean.

Then it guts the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This program has done more than any other to expand local parks, recreational green spaces, and public lands enjoyed by hundreds of millions of Americans. This bill cuts this program by 80 percent, to its lowest level in history, nearly eliminating efforts to ensure that our treasured places are protected for families to enjoy for generations to come.

Then it abolishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Service, which is crucial to understanding how the changes in our national climate affect our farms, coastal communities, and businesses.

Finally, it proposes crippling cuts to the development of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency, only making our Nation more dependent on importing oil and gas from foreign countries. But what’s worst of all is that these cuts severely jeopardize the 12.5 million jobs that could be created as a result of American clean energy innovation and undermine growth in our Nation’s clean tech industries.

Even though some are calling this a cost-cutting bill, it’s really a bill to pad the pockets of big corporations and the worst polluters. Unbelievably, it gives away \$55 million in subsidies to oil and gas companies and blocks the necessary increase in fees to inspect oil and gas stations from disasters like the BP gulf spill. That’s not all.

The bill includes 39 different environmental policy bans that open up our natural resources to greedy polluters and keep our environmental agencies from doing their jobs to protect us from contamination. It allows more soot pollution in our air by blocking critical public health standards that ensure our air is very healthy for Americans to breathe.

It blocks the EPA from implementing greenhouse gas pollution

standards for new cars in 5 years, jeopardizing 7,000 new jobs and the estimated 2.4 million barrels of oil a day saved in just two decades. It prohibits my home State of California from moving ahead with its own clean air standard. It exempts oil companies from complying with Clean Air Act standards for offshore drilling—again, protecting the special interests of Big Oil.

□ 1610

It puts the drinking water of 117 million Americans at risk by blocking EPA from keeping our water clean—half of America's streams and some 20 million acres of wetlands. It allows the unregulated discharge of pesticides directly into our rivers and lakes.

This bill is a direct attack, a declaration of war, on our air, water, wildlife, and wildlands. It is clear that this bill isn't about cutting spending. It is about cutting years off our children's lives by increasing their exposure to contaminants in the air and water. The Republicans are putting polluters ahead of the health and safety of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, when some of us go home and we speak to different groups about how Congress conducts its business, one of the parts of those conversations that may be hard to understand is that we have personal relationships and that we have people on both sides of the aisle who we respect and we like. So especially during these times it becomes difficult for some of us when, for instance, a person like myself looks at a Chairman ROGERS or a Chairman WOLF or a Chairman SIMPSON, and we know that these are good people who are totally confused as to what it is we're supposed to be doing.

You say to a Republican these days, Good morning; and he or she answers, Cut the budget.

The sky is blue.

Cut the budget.

We all understand the need to get certain amounts of spending under control, but the problem is that some folks—and this bill shows that—continue to totally misunderstand that, yes, we may have economic issues that we have to deal with—that's a given—but we are also still—and are perhaps forever—the greatest country on Earth.

How did we get there?

We didn't get there because we decided every couple of years to simply cut the budget. We got there because we invested money; because we created, yes, rules; because we created, yes, laws that protected our way of life

and the way that we wanted our future generations to be treated.

What you see across the board now is this belief that if you get the budget down to a certain number—and I say this profoundly sarcastically, perhaps, that some people would like to get it to zero, and I don't know what happens constitutionally after that if the budget is at zero—then the country will do better and everything will be well. Couple that with the fact that, while some folks on that side are, in fact, strong believers that you must cut spending, others have taken the opportunity to roll back language, to roll back regulations that have made the environment safer, that have made our lives better, that have made us safer as Americans.

The public is being told it's about cutting the budget. The public is being told it's about not having a national debt. The public is being told it's about the future of our country in terms of what we owe. Yes, that is a legitimate concern; but what the country is not being told is that, for instance, in this bill, through riders, we are going back, perhaps not even to the sixties, but to the fifties or even the forties on environmental issues and on other issues.

So what we need to do is to continue to be a voice on this side, as well as the folks on that side who believe as I do, that this is a wrong route to take and that we have to continue to stand up and say, We all understand the need to address the issues we have to, but we can't throw away everything that we've had; we can't throw away everything that we've built, and we can't simply not invest in the future.

I sit on other committees, committees that have traditionally given us an opportunity to invest. Somewhere right now in this country, there is a person, male or female, sitting with a white robe, in a laboratory, who is coming up with the next medicine, the next Velcro, if you will—the next invention that will make us a better Nation and a better society, that will help us and help the world.

If you look at those budgets—and they'll be coming to a floor near you pretty soon—those budgets are devastated when it comes to investing money in research. So, while it's good to tell the public to cut the budget, we need to be honest and say, In the process, we may set you back 30 or 40 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. This bill, H.R. 2584, is a terrible bill. It is a terrible bill for our country, and it represents an assault on our environment.

Actually, I was looking through the various assessments about this bill, this Interior and Environment appropriations legislation for 2012, from different advocacy groups out there that are concerned about the environment, that are concerned about clean air and

clean water. That's the word they kept using, "assault." This is an assault on clean water. It's an assault on clean air. It's an assault on conservation. It continues the assault that was begun at the beginning of this year with H.R. 1—to completely dismantle our environmental protections.

I confess to you, I just don't understand the motivations of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Do we not breathe the same air? Do we not drink the same water? Do we not traverse the same beautiful terrain across this country? I can't imagine. I can't fathom what the motivation is to engage in this wholesale attack on our environment.

Let's look at that attack.

They are proposing to cut the EPA's budget. This is the agency that is charged with protecting our environment. They are proposing to cut that budget by 18 percent below 2011 levels and by 40 percent below 2010 levels.

I come from the Chesapeake Bay. I grew up fishing for crabs in the Nanticoke River on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. My grandmother lived in Salisbury. That's where we used to go during the summers. This would be devastating for the Chesapeake Bay. It cuts funding to the Chesapeake Bay Program, which is designed to put the Bay on a pollution diet so we can clean up the Chesapeake Bay. This would undermine that. It puts all these policy riders on it. It's loaded up with policy riders. It would prevent the regulation of coal ash as a hazardous waste. We have that issue in my district, regulating coal ash. I want the Environmental Protection Agency to be able to do that work, but this bill would undermine it. So it is an assault on clean water, and that affects the Chesapeake Bay.

Let's look at what else it does.

It's an assault on clean air. This bill, with all of these policy riders, would block standards to cut air pollution from cement kilns, delaying standards for power plants by 6 months, standards that would do—what?—reduce mercury, arsenic and lead in the air. Don't we want to do that? So why would we undermine that effort?

It would exempt oil companies. Now, this is no surprise. That has become a common practice. How many exemptions can we give to the oil and gas industry? Here is another one. It would exempt oil companies from complying with the Clean Air Act in offshore drilling operations. It's an assault on clear air. Do you know what? A study was done by the EPA that said the air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act, if maintained for the period from 1990 to 2020, will result in \$2 trillion in savings for this country and will prevent 230,000 deaths. So why would you want to undermine the protections with respect to our clean air?

□ 1620

It's an assault on environmental education, taking funding away from the

National Park Service in terms of needed construction that has to be done. It's an assault on our National Wildlife Refuges. The reduction in funding for our National Wildlife Refuges would result in 140 of them being closed. That's 25 percent of them across the country. It's an assault on conservation, reducing the Land and Water Conservation Fund to a 45-year low of \$66 million. That's an 80 percent cut from 2011 levels.

But here is the great shame of it.

The great shame of it is the American people are ready to step up and be stewards of the environment. They want to do that. They want to take ownership in their own backyards, but they can't do it if the Federal Government isn't there as a partner, so I urge the defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. The American public was concerned mainly about two things in this last election:

A, jobs—trying to get opportunities for themselves and their children and young people to earn a living. They were also concerned, correctly, about the debt and deficit that confronts this country. Those were the two items that they were very focused on and concerned about, and I think almost everyone on this floor shares their concerns.

I got no message from any voter that I ought to come to Congress and undermine the air, water, land that they survive on, recreate on and rely on for the quality of their lives. Not one constituent, whether they voted for me or against me, said, "Undermine the protections of our land and water and air." Not one. However, that is what we're dealing with today—not jobs, not deficit—but undermining the integrity of our air, our water and our land.

I rise, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in strong opposition to this bill, which puts some of our Nation's most precious natural resources at severe risk. This bill slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by nearly 20 percent, after a year in which its funding already declined by 16 percent. The result of these cuts will be an agency unequipped.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't have to address you, but if I didn't under the rules have to address you, I would address all of America about their concerns about this undermining of the Environmental Protection Agency. Americans want the environment protected. They don't want that effort undermined.

It will mean higher risks of dirtier air, unsafe water and carbon pollution in our atmosphere. No American said that that's what they wanted when they talked to me.

This bill also includes a rider that would defund the listing of endangered

species and habitats—a true failure of environmental stewardship.

Perhaps worst of all, this bill comes with 39 separate anti-environment riders that cater to some of our Nation's most powerful special interests.

Now maybe I missed it. Maybe there's an American somewhere who said, "Look, protect the special interests and undermine our environment," but I just missed talking to them maybe. Maybe that was it.

These riders would endanger and exploit our public resources, including such treasures as the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River, the quality of our Nation's air and water for the private gain of just a few.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which reinvests money we can gain from offshore oil and gas drilling into protecting our public lands—now, we have just seen a dramatic assault on our lands on the gulf coast—it's cut 78 percent from the current year's funding in this bill.

Communities waiting for funding for new sewer and drinking water systems will find a 40 percent cut from current levels. No American asked me for that.

In 1995, the very first vote the new Republican majority cast was on a bill like this one, one that attempted to slash the EPA and an active wish list of special interest priorities. The year is different but the policy is the same. But there was one major difference. That failed bill had just 17 environmental riders—less than half of this one. This one has 39. These provisions do nothing to control spending. They are end-runs simply around laws to protect our environment.

Now, as then, the wish list deserves to be voted down. Sherry Boehlert, who was a member of the Natural Resources Committee, stood on this floor when that 1995 bill was offered. A Republican leader in the House of Representatives said: Do not do this to our land, our air, and our water.

Let me close by quoting the wise words of the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, my colleague and friend Congressman JIM MORAN: "There are those who want to make this controversy between humans and the environment, but that is a false assertion."

I urge you to read the balance of Mr. MORAN's quote in opposing this bad bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. H.R. 2584 is, without question and without precedent, the most regressive, destructive, and shameless attack on our environmental protections, this country's public health, and conservation in over four decades.

This is accomplished through the backdoor changes, 40 ideologically driven policy riders in the legislation,

and it's easily the biggest payout to polluters and special interests who helped craft these riders and who are now adding those to our laws. And it's also accomplished on the riders, riders on an appropriations bill that legislates.

It's also accomplished through defunding agencies, such as the EPA, so that their oversight is weakened and their enforcement becomes non-existent.

Giveaway public lands. These mechanisms are used in this legislation to not only undermine but to dismantle protections that have been part of the legacy of this Nation for years upon years and decade upon decade. Matters of life and death to the American people, clean air and clean water, are left without funding to protect American families.

And the legislation before us does not create jobs. If the reason of the deficit—the reason that this is being done, as we hear from the other side, is for deficit reduction, that sounds hollow and contrived when one measures the cost of public health and cleanup that awaits the taxpayer in the very near future. It sounds hollow when the taxpayer sees the tax breaks, the public resource giveaways, and unregulated privileges to industry and big business. It seems hollow when the average American taxpayer suffers both the financial and human costs of this legislation.

Let me use one example of a rider introduced by my colleague from Arizona, a son of Arizona, to the Grand Canyon. This would effectively defund any opportunity to study, to analyze the consequences of uranium mining on 1 million acres around the Grand Canyon.

□ 1630

If anything else were to be an important point for this Congress, it is the icon of all our national parks, the Grand Canyon. And the uranium mining in that area has caused damage to people and the environment for years upon years. And now with this rider, we are perpetuating the same climate, the same strategy that has caused the problems in the area. We are jeopardizing the water, the Colorado River, and water users in Nevada, California, and Arizona. And they use an expert; they tout an expert, as of today and recently, a person who rationalized that there will be no real damage to the Grand Canyon. Isn't it ironic and somewhat interesting to note that this expert is sitting on 30 or more mining claims in the withdrawal area around the Grand Canyon and would stand to do very, very well financially upon the sale and resale of these claims? This is the expert.

This legislation, H.R. 2584, is a feeding frenzy for polluters, Big Oil, and speculators who make their huge profits by cutting corners, ignoring regulations, and skirting the responsibilities that we all have to follow the law. Now

their mission has an eager partner—the majority of the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation and to protect the health of the American people and the health of our legacy as a Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, as we sit and endure this mini-filibuster about how horrible Republicans are when it comes to this bill and the environment, I want to give a perspective about how some of these riders actually got in the bill.

I and a number of my colleagues have spent a lot of time talking with this EPA, this EPA administrator, and it's like talking to this lectioner. Nothing gets through. And I want to bring to your attention one particular matter that I put in this bill that's a rider, and it has to do with the U.S. EPA draft notice 2010-X, and that was a notice that went out to the manufacturers of lawn fertilizers.

Now, everybody in the Chamber would agree that the people who manufacture lawn fertilizer, what they put in the bag should be safe; it should not harm the environment; and it should actually what do it's supposed to do, and that's grow grass or do something else. However, the EPA, because they had precious little to do, decided that they weren't content with regulating what was in the bag. They want to regulate what's on the bag, and not the list of ingredients but what the product is called.

So draft regulation 2010-X says that these companies need to reevaluate the trademark names—some of them that have been in effect since the 1960s—and remove those that the EPA determines are misleading to the public. Now I sat down with Ms. Jackson, the administrator of the EPA, and went over this. She sort of smiled and said, You know what, this really doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I brought it up in subcommittee last year and withdrew it at the request of the then-majority who said they'd work on it. Well, it's still here.

And here is a list of the words that they determined you can't use if you are in a lawn fertilizer business: “Germ shield,” “100 percent protection,” “professional grade,” “pro,” “safe,” “safer,” “safest,” “natural,” “environmentally safe,” and “green.”

Now, hold on a minute. There's a company in Ohio. It's not in my district—full disclaimer—but it's called Scotts, and they make a product called Turf Builder. They also make a product called Turf Builder Pro. This draft notification tells them they can't call it “Pro” anymore because it's misleading to the public, even though the word “Pro” was installed to create a brand that small hardware stores could sell so you didn't have to go to the big-boxes, the Wal-Marts, the Kmart, and

those other companies. So it's a niche brand for smaller retailers. But you can't call it that anymore.

You can't claim that a bag of lawn fertilizer does anything green, unless that “green” applies to livability and sustainability. Now, Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up, green was a color. This folder was green. Not anymore. If I can't demonstrate this folder has something to do with livability and sustainability, I am misleading the people that are watching this program.

There's another company in Ohio that's over in Toledo—Ms. KAPTUR's district—they have a product called Anderson's Golf Pro. And the EPA has indicated that they are not allowed to call it “Golf Pro” anymore because you don't have to use the seed or the weed and seed on a golf course. You could use it, Mr. Chairman, on your front lawn. So they have to call it “Anderson's Pro.” Well, wait a minute—they can't call it “Pro” anymore either because that's misleading. So they can call it “Anderson's” and hope you can figure out what you are supposed to do with it.

I told my friends at Scotts, You have really barely scratched the surface on this thing because the product that Scotts manufactures that I like so much is Miracle-Gro. Now can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, how is the EPA going to be able to certify when I put that Miracle-Gro on my tomato plant that a miracle has occurred? You are going to put a tremendous burden on the Vatican. All these little old ladies are going to be at the airport, flying over to Rome to talk to the College of Cardinals and say, Did a miracle occur? That's why some of these riders are in here. You have to be able to talk to people. And if they won't talk to you, you have to take action, as is contemplated by the Constitution as a co-equal branch in the government. We have done that. And I'm sorry that it offends some of our colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HOLT. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, when Americans think of America, they think of our great resources. Now for Big Oil, that probably means the oil that's found on public lands and off our shores, where they can get it for a song and charge a fortune.

But for most Americans, it's the spacious skies and purple mountain majesties. This bill, this legislation that we're considering here now has no appreciation for America's priceless resources. According to the League of Conservation Voters, though, going farther than just beautiful vistas or purple mountain majesties, “This bill is the biggest assault on the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear to ever come before Congress.” Continuing, the Clean Water Network or

the American Lung Association or the American Public Health Association or Physicians for Social Responsibility, they all go on to point out that the budget cuts or policy riders in this legislation undermine the laws that protect public health and reduce health care costs for all by preventing adverse health outcomes, including cancer, asthma attacks, strokes, and emergency department visits. It is not just for the beauty of this country, although that might be reason enough to try to preserve all of these things; it is for the health of America's people.

This legislation would put children's health at risk at the same time that it would be exempting oil companies from complying with clean air standards. We cannot tolerate this. Unregulated discharge of pesticides into our waterways, withholding funding for wild lands, allowing uranium mining all around the Grand Canyon. Mr. Chairman, this is an unprecedented attack, and not just on those things I've mentioned, not just on lifesaving public health protections and essential pollution control; it's an attack on science as well.

This bill includes reductions in funding for the U.S. Geological Survey, research in climate and land use, scientific research, monitoring, modeling, forecasting. Let me give an example: The Landsat 7 satellite just in the past month has been used to track the largest fire in Arizona's history. Yet because of the cuts that would come to pass through this legislation, the data coming from the Landsat system would go unrecorded, unanalyzed, unused. Talk about false economy.

And it's an unprecedented attack on our public lands. The largest cut in the Land and Water Conservation Fund that most of the Members of this House have seen in their service. And I must say, that's particularly important to a State like mine, New Jersey. My constituents reside in the most densely populated State in the Union, and yet they've demonstrated again and again with their votes their support for open space preservation, for fighting sprawl, for providing their kids, our kids, with safe places to experience the outdoors.

□ 1640

Mr. Chairman, there is a long list of reasons, and you'll be hearing still more about why this is terrible legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. TSONGAS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2584, and am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using this appropriations process to put at risk the air that we breathe, the water that we drink, our public lands, and our public health.

For example, this bill would dismantle the Clean Water Act, which

would not only undermine our constituents' access to clean and healthy waterways but also would mean the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

My district, the Fifth District of Massachusetts, is home to dozens of remarkable rivers and streams which are a key part of the history, culture, economy, and natural beauty of the Fifth District. Most of our rivers have excellent water quality; and it is common on warm days to see people swimming, fishing, and paddling. But our rivers were not always so hospitable. There was a time when the Merrimack River, one of the largest watersheds in New England and the river that flows through my hometown of Lowell, was a depository for waste and pollution. For 150 years, the Merrimack River was one of the 10 most polluted rivers in the country. It was the Clean Water Act enforcement of the early 1970s that changed the future of our rivers. Because of the act, and the enforcement authority it afforded the EPA, a clean-up plan was put in place and polluters and violators were held responsible. Slowly, the Merrimack and surrounding rivers were monitored and improved to meet the clean water standards we take for granted today. This is just one unfortunate example, but replicated all across our country, to our great good fortune and that of our children and grandchildren.

While some States may adequately protect their waters on their own, not all do. That is why Congress has given the EPA the authority to protect our waterways under the Clean Water Act. We must continue to strengthen safeguards for rivers and streams to ensure that all across the country Americans enjoy the benefit of clean, safe water.

I urge my colleagues to reject the shortsighted proposal to undercut the Clean Water Act and help protect America's clean water legacy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to a reckless and unconscionable Interior appropriations bill put forward by the House Republican majority. Once again, they have put a radical, out-of-touch agenda and the desires of Big Oil and big polluters before the interests of the American people, the need to create jobs, and the health of our environment. This appropriations bill is more than just a danger to the health and safety of American families. It represents the worst assault on clean air and clean water in our Nation's history.

This legislation slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 18 percent. The majority has shown time and time again that it opposes any environmental regulation that might hurt the bottom line of polluters. But it doesn't stop there.

This legislation also slashes the Clean Water State Revolving Fund,

which helps States finance wastewater system improvements by providing 55 percent of the resources, meaning that America's waterways will be put at risk of sewage and urban runoff pollution, and good middle class jobs will be lost. And it cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which protects national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges from development, by 78 percent. In addition, this partisan legislation includes at least 38 policy riders that, for purely ideological reasons, would harm American families and the environment.

The bill would prohibit the EPA from implementing rules to protect communities from power plant pollution. It blocks the EPA from restoring Clean Water Act protections to more than half of our Nation's streams and 20 million acres of wetlands, meaning the drinking water of 117 million Americans is put at risk. It blocks the EPA from moving forward on fuel efficiency standards that will reduce foreign oil imports and cut pollution. It blocks the EPA from regulating carbon pollution at power plants, refineries, and industrial sites. It even stops indefinitely long overdue standards to control air pollution from toxic mercury, endangering pregnant women, infants and children.

This legislation would open up more of our coastline to offshore drilling and 1 million acres of land around the Grand Canyon, a national treasure, to toxic uranium mining.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the Republican Party was known as defenders of the environment. It was a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who inaugurated the National Forest Service and who worked to conserve 230 million acres of American land, including the Grand Canyon, which is now put at risk. He called the canyon, and I quote, a natural wonder, which is in kind absolutely unparalleled throughout the rest of the world. "Leave it as it is," he said. "You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it."

It was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who signed significant expansions of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts and who brought life to the Environmental Protection Agency. Twenty years later, another Republican President, George Bush, Sr., expanded the Clean Air Act even further to protect Americans' health.

Yet today, a Republican majority brings us an Interior appropriations bill which undoes all of this good work, which endangers American families and threatens to do permanent and irrevocable damage to the environment.

I urge my colleagues in the majority, return to your roots to once again put the American people before the interests of polluters, and to oppose this disastrous legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. Instead of working on a bipartisan solution to address the looming default crisis or to create American jobs, today House Republicans have brought to the floor H.R. 2584, unprecedented legislation that would gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to give bigger profits to Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

By attaching more than three dozen policy riders to this bill, the House GOP is attempting to use a spending bill to make backdoor changes to 40 years of Federal laws that protect clean air, water, lands, and wildlife. The legislation would also cripple the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting American citizens and our natural resources.

This is a new low for the 112th Congress, which has already seen the new House GOP majority attempt to gut the Clean Air Act, overturn the Clean Water Act, repeal cost-saving energy efficiency standards, and pull the plug on American jobs in clean energy innovation and manufacturing. This legislation would overturn 40 years of bipartisan progress protecting the American people and the environment.

One area I choose to focus on is the continued attacks on the Clean Air Act, which has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and improved the health of Americans in every State. It protects the air we breathe and the water we drink. It protects our children from developing asthma and our seniors from developing emphysema. According to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives. Since 1990, the EPA estimates the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

It is clear that the Republican majority is doing all it can to stop EPA from carrying out its mission of protecting public health and protecting the environment. Many will claim that the EPA is moving at a faster pace than any other administration in history. However, the EPA has proposed fewer Clean Air Act rules under President Obama over the past 24 months than in the first 2 years of either President Bush or President Clinton.

That is why in December of 2010, 280 groups, including the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association and others sent a letter urging the Congress to "reject any measure that would block or delay the United States Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job to protect all Americans from life-threatening air pollution."

□ 1650

This bill, an appropriation bill, is not the place to legislate these types of changes. These should be policy changes, not made during this process.

The Clean Air Act is promoting innovation and breaking Americans' oil dependence, but Republicans would give big polluters a loophole to roll back our clean energy progress and continue our addiction to foreign oil. The Clean Air Act is good for the economy. Many studies have shown that the Clean Air Act's economic benefits far exceed any costs associated with the law by as much as 40–1 ratio.

As President Obama so eloquently spoke of during his State of the Union address, we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our global competitors and win the future. Rolling back a law that protects the air our children breathe to allow oil companies, companies that are already reaping record profits the ability to spew chemicals, smog, soot and pollution into the air just to please a lobbyist or a big oil corporation is irresponsible and, yes, extreme.

The Clean Air Act has been on the books for decades with positive results for our economy, our environment, and our businesses. Rolling back these protections will hurt our most vulnerable. We simply cannot afford to go backward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill before us today represents an all-out assault on clean air, clean water, and land conservation efforts in our country. To be clear, passage of this measure is an absolute abandonment of this body's responsibility to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

This bill seriously undermines the significant advances that we've made as a country as responsible stewards of our land and natural resources, our wildlife, our air, and our water. And perhaps most important, this legislation is a threat to the health and well-being of all Americans.

Some have argued that the riders attached to this bill are sensible and an attempt to rein in what they call the excesses of the Environmental Protection Agency and job-killing regulations. This is an absurd claim. This legislation is nothing more than a complete caving in to special interests and Big Oil and some of our Nation's worst polluters.

For the people I represent in the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, the stunning reductions to the EPA and the related policy riders that strike against the gains we've made to clean air and clean water are a threat to public health and the environment.

Let me give you one example, Mr. Chairman: According to reports from

Rhode Island Clean Water Action, Rhode Island has the third highest rate of childhood asthma in the Northeast and the fifth highest nationally. The State spends \$316 million providing health care for problems attributed to particulate matter every year.

What's more, 27,000 Rhode Island children currently suffer from asthma. The average length of a hospitalization stay for children with asthma in Rhode Island is 2 days, with an average cost of \$7,840.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to realize that the drastic reductions and the anti-environment riders in this bill threaten not only our air and water quality, but they will have real and economic consequences on real people, on real families, increasing health care costs, generating additional lost days of work and productivity, and inciting detrimental long-term health and developmental consequences for our children.

In addition, this bill slashes vital infrastructure funding that's not only essential to protecting our environment and public health, but also creates jobs and supports State and local economic development opportunities.

This bill sets the Clean Water State Revolving Fund at 55 percent, or \$833 million below the FY 2011 level. The bill sets the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund 14 percent below the fiscal year 2011 level, and that's a cut of \$134 million.

I'd like to read an excerpt from the 2010 annual report of the Rhode Island Clean Water Finance Agency, the entity charged with administering Federal and State programs relating to municipal wastewater and drinking water financial assistance: "A revolving fund allows the perpetual availability of funds to assist local governmental units in meeting water quality goals by providing loans and other forms of financial assistance. Our primary goals are to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater, help provide safe drinking water, and to provide low interest loans to cities and towns to help citizens repair failed, failing or substandard septic systems."

Undeniably, at this moment we're working to rein in our public debt, we have to be smart about the investments we make. Just consider the mission of this State agency whose efforts are supported through the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater and to provide safe drinking water. These are fundamental objectives to safeguard the health and well-being of Rhode Islanders and of men, women and children all across this country.

And what's the response by our friends on the other side of the aisle in this Congress? To cut these vitally important infrastructure programs by more than \$1 billion. If this Congress wants to be serious about reigning in spending, we can no longer try to fool ourselves with the misguided belief

that critical infrastructure projects, especially those supported through State revolving funds that protect our health and environment, are going to miraculously become less expensive with time.

Reducing Federal funds that help support these kinds of projects to improve our water and wastewater systems will only incite deferred maintenance. Deferred maintenance only makes future projects more expensive and, in many instances, will increase the likelihood of infrastructure failures that threaten public health and the environment and impede economic growth. These will undoubtedly cost us more in the long run.

Some have called this bill the worst assault on clean air and clean water in history. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this assault on the health, welfare, and economic vitality of our States, our cities, and our towns. Let us not be known as the Congress who betrayed our solemn responsibility to be good stewards of the earth.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Having set sail in search of new shores for pirating and profiteering, it's quite apparent that the GOP is lost at sea under the helm of a confused, misguided leadership. Under the guise of austerity and deficit reduction, they have plotted our Nation on a fateful course that will only result in the surging of torrents of sewage, untreated chemicals and other hazardous materials into our rivers, streams and creeks, along with factories, plants and refineries belching smoke, smog and mercury into our blue skies. Sick children and the aged who suffer from asthma, respiratory illnesses, they'll get sicker and sicker, while oil and gas companies and mining companies get fatter and fatter.

Mr. Chair, as I see it, this bill is nothing more than an attempt to remove 40 years of Federal laws that protect our air, water, land, and wildlife. Only in a Republican-controlled House would we increase access to oil and gas leases, while reducing our ability to ensure drilling operations are environmentally safe.

Only in a Republican-controlled House would we reduce the ability of States to safely manage their sewage and wastewater run off.

And, Mr. Chair, only in a Republican-controlled Congress would we allow more uranium mining near the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Chair, these efforts are opposed by the majority of Americans who believe in oversight of drilling operations, protection from tainted drinking water, and those who believe that the Grand Canyon, with all of its majestic beauty, should be a natural national treasure for the enjoyment of

families and tourists, not a wasteland laid bare by mining companies whose insatiable appetite for profit is equaled only by the magnitude of the damage they would inflict upon our environment.

□ 1700

These aren't the rants and raves of liberal environmentalists hell-bent on protecting nature at all costs. These are the sentiments of red-blooded Americans who believe that our natural resources, like the Grand Canyon, improve our quality of life.

The American people don't want progress if progress means that our skies get darker, our water gets murkier, and they don't want our wildlife to go extinct, but clearly that will be the effect of this bill should this ill-gotten measure pass.

Mr. Chairman, day after day, week after week, and month after month House Republicans hand out life preservers to special interests while kicking the American people overboard like the bundled tea kicked overboard by the real tea partiers at the start of the American Revolution. Sure our children have asthma, but big business gets to pump more pollution into our air. Sure our water is tainted, but special interests get to dump runoff in our streams. Yes, our endangered species are slowly fading away, but now we can drill in their habitats. What happens, Mr. Chairman, when our air becomes too dirty to breathe, when our water becomes too dirty to drink, and when our wildlife all go extinct?

I urge a "no" vote on this bill. But before I close, I would like to remind my colleagues across the aisle that the captain always goes down with the ship. And that's the real deal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Colleagues, Mr. Chairman, if I might, I just wanted to start by acknowledging the loss of our valiant Capitol Police, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were honored today. I just wanted to acknowledge the men and women of the United States Capitol Police for their service, and my sympathy again to the families of Officer Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

I also wanted to make note of my worshipping with the Norwegian Seamen's Church yesterday in Houston and let the Norwegian people and the people of Norway, of course, know that America stands with them during this very difficult time.

I thought it was appropriate to acknowledge those tragedies because it is a time when we have had to come together. And I also believe that as we look at where we are today, this should be an opportunity for us to be able to

come together. So I'm disappointed in this legislation because it really does not seem to call us to do that.

I want to remind America and my colleagues that we are 50 States, but there are times when we act on behalf of our States and districts and there are times when it is important to exist as a single nation.

One single State did not defend the Nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor; we came together. One State on its own or one region did not end segregation and establish civil rights; we did it together.

There are times when the stakes are so high that we simply must unite. And so I raise the question of: Where are we with this bill that seems to attack both clean air and clean water by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed from chemical companies from entering rivers and streams?

I come from the energy sector, and I believe that the energy sector creates jobs. I also believe that we can be a good neighbor, strong in our domestic development and production, but also concerned about clean air, clean water and the environment.

When you listen to those who have worked in this area for so long, you hear opposition from the Wilderness Society that says this Interior bill is an extreme assault on America's bedrock—environmental protection; the Clean Water Network that says these severe spending and budgetary cuts in this bill include not only cuts but a series of policy riders, really having no place in the appropriations process; and the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, these budget cuts and/or policy riders would impact EPA's ability to do their job.

I don't know if our Members realize that in 2011 we cut 16 percent from the EPA; now we want to cut 18 percent, over \$1.5 billion. That cripples the very agency that protects our water and our air, protects our children and our elderly.

What is the response to our responsibility to be the custodians of this wonderful Nation? What a beautiful country we have. And then to hear that another one-third is being cut from the National Landscape and Conservation System that does monuments and trails and our wild rivers. How many families pack up in times that are hard and take those family members on a road trip to travel the beauty of this Nation—the tall mountains, the deep valleys, and the wonderful rivers?

Well, let me tell you what this legislation will do. It will be a bill with a litany of additional cuts, important for programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is a program that, in essence, assaults what we're trying to do here in America.

How many friends know that we have been able to prevent 230,000 deaths each

year by regulating toxins in the air? We've already heard my colleagues come to the floor of the House and talk about the rising increase in many cities of asthma.

So let me make it very clear: We want to create jobs. I have joined together where we can deregulate and disentangle the regulations that would keep us from creating jobs. But I also believe that when it comes to protecting the Nation's assets, we join together as Republicans and Democrats.

I remind you that none of this creates jobs. I remind you that we have already engaged in these cuts. Isn't it interesting that in regular order we are now doing, even though there is disagreement, what our friends on the other side of the aisle said they can't do? That's why they're not raising the debt ceiling. But I will tell you that these draconian cuts, along with the draconian debate on the debt ceiling, is what is going to undermine America.

Let's stand as Americans unified to fix this crisis.

First, I would like to thank my friends in the Congressional Progressive Caucus who are here today to stand up for the environment, and the health of our constituents. I am saddened that so many of my Republican friends are willing to sacrifice the quality of the very air we breathe, and water that we drink.

This harmful legislation cuts the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by 18 percent, in addition to a 16 percent cut in funding for FY 2011. This is unacceptable; in order to protect the environment without harming industry, we must reach a compromise instead of haphazardly slashing the EPA budget.

The cuts to the EPA budget included in the bill reduce funding for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, grants for state implementation of environmental programs, and restorative funding for the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay and Puget Sound.

The Administration estimates that cuts to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund will cut off funding for nearly 400 wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects, resulting in thousands of lost jobs.

These cuts purposefully limit the EPA's ability to ensure that all Americans have access to drinking water that does not contain harmful pathogens and toxins that expose Americans to serious risks, such as typhoid, hepatitis, cancer, and organ damage.

This legislation has attached several riders to further undermine the Clean Water Act, by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed by chemical companies from entering rivers and streams, and stopping the EPA from treating coal ash as hazardous waste.

The assault on public health does not stop with the quality of our drinking water; this bill also takes drastic steps to weaken the Clean Air Act. A rider is attached that will prevent the EPA from implementing the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, a regulation that was implemented to protect the public from dangerous air pollution and prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, and 400,000 cases of aggravated asthmas.

As a Representative of the 18th District of Houston, I am firmly committed to protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink, and

the land we need for our survival. Since 1999, Houston has exchanged titles with Los Angeles for the poorest air quality in the nation. The poor air quality is attributed to the amount of aerosols, particles of carbon and sulfates in the air. The carcinogens found in the air have been known to cause cancer, particularly in children. The EPA is the very agency charged with issuing regulations that would address this serious problem. Those regulations should be of course fair while doing the job they are intended to do.

But, my friends, the disregard this bill shows for the health of the American people does not stop there. Another rider prohibits the EPA from finalizing regulations to reduce mercury emissions from factories. There is no reason why Energy, jobs creation and the environment cannot work harmoniously.

Not only does this legislation irresponsibly eradicate life saving provisions of the Clean Air and Water Acts, it also cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) budget by 78 percent. The LWCF funds many park and outdoor recreation areas that contribute over \$700 billion to the economy and facilitate 6.5 million jobs.

This bill makes a litany of additional cuts to important programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is full of perks for special interest, and reduces our ability to facilitate the upkeep of National Parks, protect the Grand Canyon, and add species to the endangered species list.

I am outraged that my friends on the other side of the aisle would consider passing this legislation that compromises our access to healthy air and clean water; that reverses EPA regulations that were implemented to save lives. Public lands, national parks, the air, the water, the wildlife in this nation belongs to everyone, and I cannot support a bill that trades the quality of these precious resources for benefits to big business and special interest groups.

There are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, nation. One single state did not defend the nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we must unite as states and act as one.

Our Nation's parks are maintained by the National Park Service. The Park Service is responsible for preserving, restoring, and maintaining our Nation's monuments for the enjoyment of all Americans.

Recently, the Martin Luther King, Jr., National Memorial has joined other historic sites on our Nation's Mall. Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life in the pursuit of a dream. His "I Have a Dream" speech has been read and heard by millions of men, women, and children around the world.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial is one of many cherished sites honoring men and women who have advanced the society we know today; historic sites that include Freedman town and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. When the Republicans cut the National Park Service, they cut our ability to maintain and preserve our Nation's monuments.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic site is operated by the National Park Service (under U.S. Department of the Interior). This

legislation contains \$2.5 billion for the NPS, which is \$132 million below last year's level. Operation of the National Park System is funded at \$2.2 billion, which is \$10 million below FY 2011 enacted levels. This funding will allow all National Parks to remain open and NPS activities to continue through next year without furloughs or reductions in full time or seasonal employees. These cuts result in the loss of jobs and the loss of our Nation's cherished and prized history.

The EPA has a broad responsibility, for research, standard-setting, monitoring and enforcement with regard to five environmental hazards: air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, radiation, and pesticides. The EPA represents a coordinated approach to each of these problems. There has been a systematic effort to tie the hands of the EPA's ability to protect our environment and thereby protect the long term health of our Nation. Cuts to the EPA are just another means to bring down the agency. The EPA can keep our environment safe without hindering job creations. There are many critics out there who despise the EPA because they say that it is a burden to economic growth. I say that this is nonsense, for healthy populations are the foundation for prosperity.

Let us not forget what happened in Woburn, Massachusetts in the 1980s, where numerous families were afflicted with cancer as a result of toxins being placed in the water. It was the work of brilliant lawyers in conjunction with the EPA who proved that the chemical entities involved deliberately placed toxins in the water.

Let us also not forget The Love Canal of the 1970s near Niagara Falls either. In this region, scores of women had miscarriages and many more were contaminated from chemical wastes in the water. Are supporters of this bill encouraging our country to go back to a time when these problems were common?

Because the issues associated with Woburn and the Love Canal are well in the past, supporters of cuts to the EPA must feel that the water people drink is perfectly safe to drink and does not need to be regulated. Just last year in the small town of Crestwood, outside of Chicago, it was discovered that town officials were secretly introducing tainted well water into the town water supply for years. The people were told that the water came from Lake Michigan. When the story broke, the Department of Public Health conducted a survey of disease rates and found that men in the town had high rates of kidney and gastrointestinal cancer. I, for one, will not tolerate this and I know the American people will not tolerate this as well. The American people will not tolerate the fear of turning on their faucets and wondering whether or not the water coming out has lead, plutonium, or wastes from chemical entities.

Protecting the quality of our air and water, protecting the health of each and every one of our constituents, is an example of a time when Congress must consider the implications beyond our districts and our states.

Surely preventing 230,000 deaths each year by regulating toxins in the air, and ensuring that millions will not lose their access to healthy drinking water is not controversial. I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents they represent, and take essential steps to protect the environment. Until that time, I cannot, and will not, support this damaging legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in strong opposition to this reckless bill and the abundance of extraneous and irresponsible provisions that it contains.

Right now we are down to the wire on defaulting on our debt. But instead of focusing on a way forward, the majority is offering up this ill-conceived piece of legislation, a bill that is polluted—and I emphasize "polluted"—with unrelated and inappropriate riders that do not belong in a spending bill. The reality is that these riders will have very little impact on our national deficit, but they will have a huge and lasting effect on our health, our environment, and our natural resources.

So why are these programs being targeted? Well, we've seen this before with H.R. 1 earlier this year, and we're seeing it again now. The majority is choosing to reward Big Oil and polluters at the expense of the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear.

Mr. Chairman, it's not an exaggeration to say that this bill drastically undermines our government's ability to protect our environment. This bill jeopardizes the conservation and protection of places like the Channel Islands National Park in my congressional district and the wildlife this special place harbors; closing a quarter of national wildlife refuges across the country, affecting places like the Gueloupe Dunes near Santa Maria; slashing support for Federal programs that support our outstanding natural areas, like the Piedras Blancas Light Station or the Carrizo Plain National Monument in California; opening up protected and sensitive areas in California's national forest to off-road vehicle use, putting places like Los Padres National Forest at risk; and blocking the protection of wilderness-quality lands.

And as the bill stands, Mr. Chairman, it would bar new listings of threatened and endangered species as well as critical habitat designations. And it would gut the successful Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is our Nation's principal source of Federal funding to preserve irreplaceable lands and waters.

Under this disaster of a bill, the LWCF would be reduced to the lowest level in its 45-year history, an 80 percent cut compared to last year's funding.

□ 1710

And who will benefit from this cut? Not the American taxpayer because this fund is paid for from offshore drilling revenues. Instead, communities will lose important conservation and recreation projects that create jobs and improve the quality of life for working and middle class Americans.

But this assault isn't limited to our lands and wildlife. This dirty legislation is also littered with riders that seek to gut the protections of the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts, such as preventing the EPA from strengthening limitations on polluted storm water runoff, blocking the EPA's oversight on water used by power plants, and impeding the clarification of which streams and wetlands are protected under the act.

Under the House spending plan, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds will also see significant cuts. These are the funds established for States to complete water infrastructure projects, projects which create jobs and provide clean, safe drinking water. The riders in this bill, Mr. Chairman, are also an assault on the very air we breathe. They would prevent the EPA from limiting carbon pollution from power plants and other stationary sources, from updating limits on smog and mercury emissions.

One rider would block the EPA from setting new mileage standards for cars, and won't even allow the State of California to set its own standards. Surely we can think of better solutions to solve our fiscal problems rather than attacking our air, our water, and our lands. Sadly, this Interior appropriations bill deeply undermines our important role of passing on an America whose land, water, and air are clean, healthy, productive, beautiful, and accessible for all to enjoy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible, terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, as one of the former cochairs and leaders of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the largest, bipartisan, bicameral caucus in this Congress, I reluctantly rise in strong opposition to this Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill falls short on so many different levels—especially our responsibility to future generations to be good stewards of the public lands, the vital natural resources, and the wildlife that we have within our borders.

But don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. We have had a tradition in this place for many years of having strong, bipartisan support for reasonable, sensible, land and water conservation programs. That's why earlier this month, a coalition of over 640 outdoor recreation entities sent a letter to each of our offices, including the Congressional leadership, expressing their deep concern and dismay over the funding cuts proposed in this appropriation bill.

This letter was signed by entities such as the Boone and Crockett Club, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, National Fish

and Wildlife Foundation, National Wild Turkey Foundation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited, and it was also signed by the president of The Wilderness Society, Bill Meadows, and a board member of the Civil War Trust, John Nau. I would like to read that letter at this time.

"We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great Nation.

"Like you, we are concerned about our Nation's fiscal health. The Nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempted from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

"The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation, and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

"As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our Nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge this Congress to address the Federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs in 2012."

Mr. Chairman, these groups realize, as many of us realize too, this is more than just being good stewards of the land and doing right by future generations. Investment in these vital programs is crucial for economic development and job creation in this country. The Outdoor Industry Foundation has issued a survey from year to year showing the economic impact of many of these conservation programs on outdoor recreation activities. They found that outdoor recreation contributes \$730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, supports 6½ million private sector jobs, one out of every 20 jobs, and stimulates 8 percent of consumer spending.

In Wisconsin, my home State, hunting and fishing alone supports 57,000 jobs, and \$400 million in State revenue. Sportsmen spend \$3.1 billion annually, which helps stimulate the Wisconsin economy and other States.

Mr. Chairman, the irony in all this is that these organizations and these programs have been giving at the idol of deficit reduction for some time. In fact, over the last 30 years, American investment in parks, wildlife, clean water, and clean air has fallen from 1.7 percent of overall Federal budget to less than 0.6 percent. So throughout the years, there has been a continual reduction in funding for these programs. The irony is that for many of these programs, for every public dollar used, it is leveraged to draw in more private sector dollars. This too will be in great jeopardy with the dismantling of these programs. These aren't programs you can just turn on and off with a spigot. You need a continuity of care to keep them going. With funding reductions of this magnitude, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that continuity of care. Whether it is to clean water, clean air, to wildlife preservation and enhancement, all of these programs are under a direct assault with this Interior appropriations bill.

With the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an 80 percent proposed cut, the irony with this program is that it is funded by oil royalties. It has been a grand bargain that has been used in the past to allow development of oil on public lands.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this appropriations bill. We can do better than this. We have to do better.

JULY 6, 2011.

Hon. HARRY M. REID,
U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND SPEAKER BOEHNER: We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great nation.

Like you, we are concerned about our nation's fiscal health. The nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempt from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending, and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge

this Congress to address the federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation and historic preservation programs in 2012.

Please see attached for list of signers as of 7/6/11.

Thank you.

BILL MEADOWS,
President, The Wilderness Society.

JOHN NAU,
Board Member, Civil War Trust.

We are a broad partnership of nonprofits, organizations and businesses that represent tens of millions of American citizens who believe we must elevate the importance of natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Access Fund, Alliance of National Heritage Areas, American Alpine Club, American Association for State and Local History, American Bird Conservancy, American Canoe Association, American Cultural Resources Association, American Farmland Trust, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), American Fisheries Society, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, American Forest Foundation, American Hiking Society, American Land Conservancy, American Mountain Guides Association, American Recreation Coalition, American Rivers, American Trails, American Whitewater, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Bird Conservation Network, Blue Goose Alliance, Boone and Crockett Club, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Choose Outdoors, City Parks Alliance, Civil War Trust, Congressional Sportsmens Foundation, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Endangered Species Coalition.

Great Old Broads for Wilderness, HistoriCorps, International Mountain Bicycling Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Land Trust Alliance, Marine Fish Conservation Network, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of State Park Directors, National Audubon Society, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, National Park Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, National Preservation Institute, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Wildlife Federation, National Wildlife Refuge Association, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Openlands, Organic Farming Research Foundation, Orion—The Hunters' Institute, Outdoor Alliance, Outdoor Industry Association, Outdoors America, Outward Bound U.S.A., Partnership for the National Trails System, Pheasants Forever, Portland Trails, Preservation Action, Public Lands Foundation, Quality Deer Management Association, Restore America's Estuaries, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

Saving Birds Thru Habitat, Sierra Club, Society for American Archaeology, The Center for Desert Archaeology, The Center for Large Landscape Conservation, The Coastal States Organization, The Colorado Mountain Club, The Conservation Fund, The Forest Land Group, The Hawk Migration Association of North America, The Land Connection, The Lands Council, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, The Nature Conservancy, The Trumpeter Swan Society, The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Part-

nership, Tread Lightly!, Trout Unlimited, Western Rivers Conservancy, WildEarth Guardians, Wildlands CPR, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Winter Wildlands Alliance.

STATE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL NONPROFITS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Agricultural Stewardship Association, Alabama Historical Commission, Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation, Alaska Association for Historic Preservation, Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, Alliance for Historic Wyoming, Alliance for New York State Parks, Alton Marketplace/Illinois Main Street, American Society of Landscape Architects, Amigos de la Sevilleta, Amigos de los Rios, Ammonoosuc Chapter of Trout Unlimited (New Hampshire), Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Appalachian Mountain Club, Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area, Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, Arlington Heritage Alliance, Ascutey Mountain Audubon Society, Ashland Mainstreet, Inc., Audubon Outdoor Club, Audubon Society of Northern Virginia, Baltimore Department of Recreation and Parks, Baltimore National Heritage Area, Bear-Paw Regional Greenways, Bedminster Regional Land Conservancy, Berkley Conservation Institute, Bernheim Arboretum and Research Forest, Bird City Wisconsin, Blue Mountain Land Trust, Bosco-Milligan Foundation, Boston Harbor Island Alliance, Branford Land Trust, Breckenridge Outdoor Education Center, Bull Moose Sportsmen's Alliance, CA Japanese American Community Leadership Council, Cahaba Riverkeeper, California Capitol Historic Preservation Society, California Council of Land Trusts, California Heritage Council, California Preservation Foundation, California State Historic Preservation Office, Californians for Western Wilderness, Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy, Cascade Land Conservancy, Cashiers Historical Society, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc., Center for Desert Archeology, Central Coast Land Conservancy, Central Virginia Battlefields Trust, Charles River Watershed Association, Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge.

Complex, Inc., Cherokee County Historical Society, Cherokee Forest Voices, Chesapeake Conservancy, Chesapeake Wildlife Heritage, Chicago Wilderness, Chisago Lakes Main Street Initiative, Chisholm Trail Heritage Museum, Cienega Watershed Partnership, City of Madisonville, City of Minneapolis, Department of Community Planning and Economic Development, City of Shelby, Clinton Brown Company Architecture ReBuild, Coastal Conservation League, Colorado Mountain Club, Colorado Preservation, Inc., Columbus Landmarks Foundation, Community Open Land Trust, Connecticut Audubon Society, Connecticut Preservation Action, Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, Conservation Council for Hawai'i, Conservation Federation of Missouri, Conservation Trust for North Carolina, Cooks Creek Watershed Association, Crossroads of the American Revolution, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, D&R Canal Watch, DC Preservation League, Deer Creek Museum, Glenrock Historical Commission, Delaware and Raritan Canal Coalition, Delaware Highlands Conservancy, Delmarva Ornithological Society, Eau Claire Historic Preservation Foundation, Endangered Habitats League, Environmental League of Massachusetts, Finger Lakes Land Trust, Fire Island Land Trust, Florida Trail Association, Inc.

Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina, Forest Trust, Foundation for Historical Louisiana, Four Corners School of Outdoor Edu-

cation, Frederick Historic Sites Consortium, Friends of Acadia, Friends of Back Bay, Friends of Blackwater, Friends of Camas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Congaree Swamp, Friends of Dyke Marsh, Friends of Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Texas, Friends of Hakalau Forest, Friends of Heinz Refuge at Tinicum, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Friends of Las Vegas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Louisiana Wildlife Refuges, Inc., Friends of Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Necedah National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Nevada Wilderness, Friends of Noxubee Refuge, Friends of Princeton Nursery Lands, Friends of Princeton Open Space, Friends of Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Red Rock Canyon, Friends of Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Shiawassee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Sunkhaze Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of the Arapaho Wildlife Refuge Complex, Friends of the Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Inc., Friends of the Florida Panther Refuge, Friends of the National Wildlife Refuges of Rhode Island, Friends of the Neches River, Friends of the Prairie Learning Center.

Friends of the Refuge Headwaters, Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument, Friends of the Southwest Louisiana Wildlife Refuges and Wetlands, Friends of the Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Wallkill River, Friends of Wertheim National Wildlife Refuge, Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation, Georgia Forest Watch, Georgia Land Conservation Center, Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, Glendale Heritage Preservation, Gold Coast & Hamburg Historic District Association, Grand Canyon Trust, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association, Greater Houston Preservation Alliance, Greater Lovell Land Trust, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Greenbelt Land Trust, Guam Historic Resources Division, Harris Center for Conservation Education, Harrodsburg First, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area, Heart of the Lakes for Land Conservation Policy, Heritage Alliance of Northeast Tennessee & Southwest Virginia, Heritage Nebraska, Heritage Ohio, Historic Annapolis, Historic Boulder, Inc., Historic Charleston Foundation, Historic Chicago Bungalow Association, Historic Denver, Historic FL Keys Foundation.

Historic Fort Worth, Inc., Historic Hawaii Foundation, Historic Kansas City Foundation, Historic Madison, Inc., Historic Preservation Alliance of Arkansas, Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend & Joseph County, Historic Preservation League of Oregon, Historic Seattle, Historic Valley Junction Foundation, History Colorado, Hoosier Environmental Council, Housatonic Valley Association, Hudson Highlands Land Trust, Huyck Preserve and Biological Research Station, Ice Age Trail Alliance, Idaho Conservation League, Idaho Rivers United, Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Idaho State Historical Society, Illinois Audubon Society, Illinois Environmental Council, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, Indian River Lakes Conservancy, Iowa Wildlife Federation, Jackson County Tourism, Jay Heritage Center, Jefferson Land Trust, John G. Riley House Museum, Kentucky Woodland Owners, Keweenaw Land Trust, Kingston Greenways Association, Kingston Historical Society, Land Conservancy of Adams County, Land Trust for Santa Barbara County,

Land Trust for the Little Tennessee, Landmarks Illinois, Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Life of the Land, Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation, Los Alamos Historical Society, Main Street Corning.

Main Street Perryville, Maine Preservation, Malheur Wildlife Associates, Marine Conservation Institute, Maryland Commission on African American History and Culture, Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Ornithological Society, Mendocino Land Trust, Messa Land Trust, Michigan Historic Preservation Network, Milford Preservation Trust, Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission, Minnesota Forestry Association, Mississippi Heritage Trust, Mississippi Land Trust, Mississippi River Trust, Mississippi SHPO, Missoula Parks and Recreation, Monadnock Conservancy, Montana Association of Land Trusts, Montana Audubon, Montana Preservation Alliance, Montana Wildlife Federation, Montpelier Mansion, Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust, MS Dept. of Marine Resources, Nantucket Historic District Commission, Napa County Landmarks, National Committee for the New River, National Outdoor Leadership School, Natural Resources Council of Maine, Natural Resources Initiative of Mississippi, Naturaland Trust, Nevada Conservation League & Education Fund, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, New Jersey Recreation and Park Association, New London Landmarks, New Mexico Archeological Council, New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance, New Mexico Wildlife Federation.

New River Land Trust, New York City Audubon, New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, NH Association of Conservation Commissions, North Carolina Coastal Land Trust, North Carolina Historic Preservation Office, North Country Trail Association, North County Conservancy, North Dakota Historical Society and State Historic Preservation Office, North Preston Properties, North Shore Land Alliance, Northeast Wilderness Trust, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Northern Sierra Partnership, Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, Northwest Watershed Institute, Norwalk Preservation Trust, Oakland Heritage Alliance, Oblong Land Conservancy, Ohio Archeological Council, Ohio Forestry Association, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Ohio Historical Society, Oklahoma Historical Society, Old Escondido Historic District, Open Space Institute, Oregon Natural Desert Association, Oregon Wild, Oregon-California Trails Association, Outside Las Vegas Foundation, Pacific Crest Trail Association, Pacific Rivers Council, Parker River Clean Water Association, Pasadena Heritage, Passaic River Coalition, Peconic Land Trust, Pleasant River Wildlife Foundation, Prairielands Preservation Foundation Board, Preservation Alliance of Philadelphia, Preservation Alliance of Minnesota, Preservation Alliance of West Virginia, Preservation America.

Preservation Buffalo Niagara, Preservation Commission, Rock Island, Illinois, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, Preservation Kentucky, Preservation Louisville, Preservation Pennsylvania, Preservation Resource Center, Preservation Texas, Inc., Preservation Trust of Vermont, Preservation Wayne, Preserve Calavera, Preserve Rhode Island, Providence Preservation Society, Public Land and Water Access Association, Putnam County Coalition to Preserve Open Space, Quindaro Ruins/Underground Railroad-Exercise 2011, Redlands Conservancy, Richland County Conservation Commission, Ridges to Rivers Open Space Network, Rio Grande Return, Riveredge Bird Club, Rock Island Arsenal Historical Society, Rock Island Preservation Society, Rowayton Arts Center, Sacred Sites International, Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy, Salem Audubon

Society, Saline Historic Downtown Alliance, San Juan Citizens Alliance, San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council, Santa Fe Conservation Trust, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, Sayre Main Street, Inc., SC Coastal Conservation League, Scenic Hudson, Scenic Virginia, Scott County Historic Preservation Society, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, Serpentine Art & Nature Commons, Inc., SEWEE Association, Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association.

Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Soda Mountain Wilderness Council, Solano Land Trust, Somers Land Trust, Sourland Planning Council, Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Spokane Preservation Advocates, St. Marks Refuge Association, Inc., Stanford White Casino Theatre corp., State Historic Preservation Office, Wisconsin Historical Society, State Historical Society of South Dakota, Swan Ecosystem Center, Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Taos Land Trust, Tapteal Greenway Association, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Ornithological Society, Tennessee Parks and Greenways Foundation, Tennessee Riverkeeper, Texas Land Conservancy, The Arkansas Audubon Society, The Audubon Society of Greater Denver, The Cazenovia Preservation Foundation, The Clinch Coalition, The Connecticut Ornithological Association, The Conservancy of Montgomery County, The Cragmoor Conservancy, Inc., The Delaware River Greenway Partnership, The Foundation for Historical Louisiana, The Georgia Conservancy, The Grand Staircase Escalante Partners, The Great Swamp Conservancy, The Harris Center for Conservation Education, The Historical Society of Harford County, Inc., The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, The Lake County Forest Preserve District, The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County, The Land Conservancy of New Jersey, The Maryland Historical Trust.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History, The Oblong Land Conservancy, Inc., The Prairie State Conservation Coalition, The Preservation League of New York State, The Trustees of Reservations, The Villagers Inc., The Warwick Conservancy Inc., TN Environmental Council, Torne Valley Preservation Association, Tug Hill Tomorrow Land Trust, Tulsa Foundation for Architecture, Upper Midwest Archaeology, Utah Heritage Foundation, Valley Conservation Council, Vanceburg Renaissance on Main, Vermont Land Trust, Virgin Islands Historic Preservation Office, Virginia Forest Watch, Voyageurs National Park Association, Wallowa Land Trust, Inc., Washington Water Trails Association, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, Washington Wildlife Federation, Weeks Bay Foundation, Western North Carolina Alliance, Western Reserve Land Conservancy, Western Resource Advocates, WHALE—New Bedford, Wheeler Wildlife Refuge Association, Whidbey Camano Land Trust, Wildlife Mississippi, Williamsburg Main Street Program, Willistown Conservation Trust, Winyah Rivers Foundation, Woodstock Land Conservancy, WV Land Trust, Young Preservation Associates of Pittsburgh.

INDUSTRIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

1% for the Planet, Acorn Products, Advanced Flexible Materials, Inc. American Alpine Institute, American Outdoor Products, Inc., American Sportfishing Association, Angling Trade Magazine, B.A.S.S. LLC, Backpacker Magazine, Big Agnes, Bison Belts, Black Diamond, Blue Ridge Outdoors Magazine, BlueWater Ropes, Boa Technology Inc., Brandwise, Inc., Breathe Magazine, C4 Waterman, CamelBak, CarbonVerde, LLC, Cascade Designs, Inc., Casual Adventure, Chaco, Colorado Kayak Supply, Confluence Films,

Conservation Easement Consultants, Dale of Norway, Inc., Dansko, Inc., Deckers Outdoor Corporation, Deneki Outdoors, Deuter USA, Inc., DNF Media, Inc.—Outdoor USA Magazine, Eastern Mountain Sports, Ecosystem Management Consultants, Elevation Outdoors Magazine, Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance, Far Bank Enterprises, Fly Fish 10k, Forest Capital Partners, G.Loomis, Inc., Gerber Legendary Blades, GoMotion Inc., Gramicci, Great Outdoor Store, Harboe Architects, PC, HCFR Outdoors, LLC.

Honey Stinger, Hornady Manufacturing, Horny Toad, Hurricane Kayaks, Immersion Research, Injinji, Karhu, KINeSYS Inc., Kokatat, Lafuma America Inc., Lawson Hammock, LEKI USA Inc., Leupold & Stevens, Liberty Mountain, Light and Motion, Loksak Inc., LOWA Boots LLC, Marmot Mountain, LLC, Merrell, Metolius Mountain Products Inc., Momentum Media PR, Morsel Munk, LLC, Mountain Gazette, Mountain Gear, Mountain Mama, Mountain Shades, Mountain Tools, Nantahala Outdoor Center, National Marine Manufacturers Association, Nau, Inc., NEMO Equipment, Inc., Nester Hosiery, New England Wood Pellet LLC, New Forests Inc., Noelani Hawaii SUP LLC, North Preston Properties, Oboz Footwear, One Source Apparel, Orvis, Osprey Packs, Outdoor Divas, Outdoor Industries and Associations Association.

Outside Adventure Film School, Pack Rat Outdoor Center, Paddlers Supply, Pennsylvania Fly Fishing Company, Petzl, Piragis Northwoods Company, Prana, Product Architects Inc., Pure Fishing, Red Wing Shoe Company, Reflex Sourcing Inc., REI, Remington Arms Company, Rock Creek Outfitters, Rose Creek Anglers, Inc., Sanitas Sales Group, Sasquatch, Saucony, Serac Adventure Films, Sierra Business Council, Skinny Skis, Small Planet, Smith Optics, SnowSports Industries America, Sport Chale, Inc., Sporting Culture Advisors, Sportworks Northwest, Inc., Sullivan-Bishop Agency LLC, Suspenz Storage Racks, Terra Public Relations, Terra Strenua Outfitters, Terramar Sports Inc., The Fly Shop, Inc., The Forest Group, The Lyme Timber Company, The Mountaineers, The Painted Trout, The Seeley Lake Nordic Ski Club, The South Carolina Aquarium, The Trailhead, The Walton Works, LLC, Thompson Manufacturing, Inc., Tierra Environmental, Timbuk2, Twenty Two Designs, LLC, W & W associates, Inc., Waterwisp Flies, West Coast Corp., Wild River Outfitters, Inc., Yellow Dog Flyfishing Adventures.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, there is an unfortunate time-honored tradition in the House of people coming to the floor and objecting to reductions in spending with heartfelt arguments as to why the spending is necessary and never offering any suggestions about where the money might be made up instead. That, frankly, is one of the reasons we have the huge deficits and debts that we do. So I want to break with that tradition and talk to you about a spending reduction I have a great concern about and then talk about how we might make it up instead.

There is not a person in this House who has not been touched in some way by cancer in their family, in someone they love, some friend. I don't think there is anybody here who hasn't had the heartbreak of dealing with malignancy in their family. Let me say from the outset, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is a Member of this House that doesn't want to do everything he or she could to deal with solving that problem. There is not a Member in this place, Republican or Democrat, who is indifferent to the problem of fighting cancer.

Now, cancer comes from a lot of things. It's genetic. It's hereditary. It comes from foods. But a lot of it comes from the environment. It comes from water. If the water we drink or we cook with or we bathe in is not clean, it can sometimes be the trigger that triggers the dreaded disease of cancer for someone we care about.

So a long time ago when this was discovered in the 1960s, there was a bipartisan agreement to try to do something to try to clean the water of this country and keep it clean. It was upheld by Presidents like Ronald Reagan and George Bush, Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, Barack Obama, many others, Democrats and Republicans in control of Congress.

That's why I have to look at the bill before us today and just be astonished by the fact that the Clean Water Fund is cut by 55 percent. Let me say that again. The fund that has been set up to protect the clean water of our country that is consumed by Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, cut by 55 percent. The amount of that cut is about \$833 million below the amount of money that we spent last year; about \$833 million.

□ 1720

Usually, people stop there. But I want to talk about where we should get the money instead.

Now, \$833 million is less than 3 days' worth of spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. How about that? We will spend more than \$833 million in the next 3 days in Kabul and Baghdad, in part to help build clean water systems there, in part to help create jobs there. I just think that's inexcusable that we find ourselves in a position where we're spending in 2 or 3 days in Iraq and Afghanistan what we could spend to eliminate this cut and provide clean drinking water for the people of our country.

The amount of subsidies we're going to give oil companies—the oil companies made record profits in 2010. They made about \$60 billion in profits, if I'm not mistaken—\$77 billion, actually, in profits last year. We'll spend six times as much of this cut in the Clean Water Fund to give money away to those oil companies this year. These are people who made \$77 billion in profits last year, whose stocks are off the charts, who are paying their CEOs hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation,

and we're going to give them about \$7 billion from the wallets of the people of this country this year. That's six times the amount of this cut in the Clean Water Fund.

So I understand if you come to the floor you've got the responsibility of saying, Well, if you don't want to cut this, you've got the responsibility to say, Where else should we get it from? I think that's a reasonable rule under which to live.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the House, my proposal would be this: Let's not reduce the Clean Water Fund by 55 percent. Let's not say to cities and villages and towns and States and Indian tribes around our country that the money that we lend to them—we don't give it to them; most of the time it's a loan—to help build clean water systems that bring clean water to our kitchens and our homes and our places of worship and work, hospitals, let's not reduce that. Instead, let's take 2½ days of what we're going to spend in Iraq and Afghanistan and put it there. Let's take one-sixth of the money we're going to hand to the oil companies and put it there.

This is something we shouldn't do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior appropriations bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to thank Ranking Member MORAN and our full committee ranking member, Congressman DICKS, for leading the fight every step of the way against this Republican assault on the environment.

Sadly, Mr. Chair, this bill is nothing more than a vehicle for bigger profits for Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

This bill and all it contains destroys critical environmental standards established to protect the public's health. By attaching more than 40 extremely dangerous policy riders, the Republicans take direct aim on the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the environment in which we live. This terrible legislation guts the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting our citizens and our national resources. It terminates air quality standards as well as land and water conservation funding that will impact all communities in our country. But these cuts will hit my home State of California especially hard.

Mr. Chair, I'm proud to serve as a Representative of California's Ninth Congressional District, which has long been at the forefront of the environmental movement, including working on critical issues of climate change as well as fighting for renewable energy, green jobs, and environmental justice.

This bill undermines the Clean Air Act's ability to crack down on air pol-

lution, threatening the quality of life for our children, our families, our communities, including my constituents in the East Bay, many of whom suffer unfairly from poor air quality.

Now, let me just tell you this personal story. Many of my childhood friends who grew up with me in my neighborhood, a polluted neighborhood in El Paso, Texas, many of them were dead before they turned 55 years of age, or many of them who are still alive have chronic or debilitating diseases. These tragedies can be directly related to environmental degradation of the neighborhoods in which I lived and grew up in in El Paso, Texas.

Also, let me just say, this bill is unjust because it really does refuse to fund EPA at a level where there can be some justice in terms of the overall programs of environmental administration, where it can implement its core mission of protecting human health and the environment. This means that more women and more children and more people facing or living in poverty and more communities of color are bearing the brunt once again of pollution, environmental degradation, and climate change. Sadly, this is in line with the Republican plan to balance the budget on the backs of the poor.

Rather than Republicans taking actions to create jobs, this bill guts funding to create jobs—especially green jobs. Rather than the Republicans taking action to protect our Nation's clean water supply and open spaces, this bill takes us back to dirty water and closed parks. Rather than taking action to ensure that people across this country can trust our government—and they want to trust us—to protect the water that they drink and the air that they breathe, this bill rolls back the standards and protections aimed at protecting public health.

Mr. Chairman, as a person of faith, I believe that there is a moral and ethical responsibility to protect the natural resources provided by our Creator. This measure before us prohibits us from acting on that very, very serious and important responsibility.

How can we here make decisions that knowingly harm people? How can we make decisions that pollute our environment? How can we make these crass decisions, as Members of Congress, that will increase health hazards leading to diseases such as cancer?

People elect us because they trust us to make decisions that protect and enhance their quality of life. They want us to preserve our beautiful planet. Future generations are counting on us. This bill really does let them down.

We need to defeat this horribly destructive bill and move quickly to matters that the American people expect us to address, like to create jobs, raise our debt ceiling, and to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. While our Nation stumbles toward a potential default, the Republican Party is wasting our time with consideration of a bill that will not move through the Senate and which the President has already threatened to veto. But even though this legislation is a futile effort, it does clearly articulate the philosophy of the Republicans in this House of Representatives. This is a bill that really makes one shake one's head. It is an astonishing effort to destroy hard-won, longstanding, and successful and popular laws. It cuts valuable health and environmental programs. It caps the responsibility of corporate polluters and balances minimal cost savings on the back of our most precious natural resources.

H.R. 2584, the funding bill for the Department of the Interior and Environmental Agencies, completely guts funding for public lands and public health programs that the American people care about and desperately need.

A 64 percent cut to the State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program and a 95 percent cut to the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Funds means we can expect a rapid increase in endangered and extinct species on Federal and non-Federal lands alike.

An 80 percent reduction in the Land and Water Conservation Fund means we should not expect adequate maintenance of landmarks, including Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; Yellowstone National Park; or California's Big Sur coast.

□ 1730

A 40 percent cut to the National Landscape Conservation System means 27 million acres of national monuments, wilderness areas, scenic rivers, and other treasures will be inadequately protected.

A 60 percent cut to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act means our birds, fish and wildlife resources will lose protections that keep these populations viable.

A 55 percent reduction to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund means less protection for water quality improvement projects in the United States.

And a prohibition of funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative means my home State of Illinois and the great Lake Michigan will lose millions of dollars in Federal assistance to promote good jobs and clean drinking water for millions of our citizens.

While this bill severely cuts these and other priorities, it provides hand-outs to corporate polluters in the form of policy riders. These riders would threaten the enforcement of the public health and environmental laws which have protected our country for decades.

One rider reverses a moratorium on uranium mining on the rim of the Grand Canyon, and would turn one of

our Nation's most iconic landmarks into an eyesore. Another extends loopholes in the Clean Water Act, jeopardizing drinking water for 117 million Americans; and many others weaken the Clean Air Act and limit regulations against toxic air pollution, which saved an estimated 160,000 lives just last year.

The Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act have protected American health and welfare for 40 years, and have been the catalyst for green energy investment and job creation. More than 80 percent of the American people believe the EPA should not be prevented from performing its duties, and the Gallup Poll reports that four out of five Americans are personally concerned about the water they drink, as well they should.

Although this legislation is dead on arrival at the White House, it poses a fundamental debate about the type of country we want to hand over to our children and grandchildren. Do we want to be a Nation that oversees the disappearance of animal populations, wetlands and national parks because we aren't willing to ask for one penny more from millionaires and billionaires? Do we want to be a Nation that turns away from water treatment and infrastructure in the hopes that no one will notice? Do we want to be a Nation that values the profits of corporate polluters over the health of children?

The Republican majority has clearly stated its position. I oppose this bill. The funding cuts and destructive policy riders that riddle this bill turn back the clock on vital environmental and health policies. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to uphold our commitment to clean air, clean water and preserved natural resources.

This weekend, my granddaughter, who celebrated her 10th birthday, had her party on Lake Michigan and enjoyed the precious clean water. I urge my colleagues to vote against this attack on our American resources and our values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I've been listening from afar to this discussion on the floor, which is so, so fascinating. The former majority, wanting so desperately to become the majority again, is suggesting that by way of this bill we're taking the heart out of America's infrastructure program.

The fact is, in just recent years, the former majority increased spending in all of these categories at levels that would almost startle the people if they'd ever see the detailed facts. The fact that we are not increasing spending to their wish lists ahead, in some way, becomes a cut in their mind's eye when we're faced with the reality that the covered wagon that took us to California from the East is about to go

over the cliff of bankruptcy if we don't do something about spending. This same voice, or series of voices, is currently doing battle over the debt limitation, and they're suggesting that we're holding this up because of some loopholes in taxes for the so-called "rich."

Conversations taking place by many of the rich of the House indeed reflect the reality that what they really want is more spending and more funding for these programs. While we're attempting to make an effort to cut back spending and to cut the impact of government on the private sector, these same voices will not give up until they have an opportunity to impose more taxes.

One of the two parties having this discussion wants more spending on government programs and wants more taxes. The other side of this discussion would suggest we ought to cut back spending, make sense out of our budget and, indeed, recognize that the private sector, in keeping some money in their jeans in order to invest in the private sector, is really the way to create jobs.

With that, it's fascinating to watch this discussion. I'll be glad to come back three or four more times and have this discussion, Mr. Chairman. In the meantime, I certainly would hope more people would talk about what they really know about the environment or really know about the Interior bill rather than the rhetoric that is part of next year's campaign.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What a fortuitous moment to have the opportunity to follow my colleague from California.

Indeed, I do know something about the Interior budget. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, and I know full good and well what the Department of the Interior means to America.

Early this morning, I left Sacramento. My mind was very much on the debate you just suggested: What are we going to do about the deficit?

But it didn't take long to realize, as I sat by the window, as I moved over the Sierra Nevada mountains into Nevada, then across to the Rockies, and across this entire Nation—for most of the way, it was rather clear—that we have an awesome, unbelievably beautiful country. We're the strongest Nation in the world, and we have great economic strength.

This bill, however, would take this great Nation, the great beauty and the incredible people of America, and put them at risk. It would put this Nation's extraordinary beauty and resources at risk. That's what this is about. This isn't going to solve the budget deficit one way or the other. This is a miniscule part of the overall Federal budget. It is important—important because

it is about this Nation's physical and human health. We're talking about the Environmental Protection Agency.

This bill as written would bring to the people of America poison. It is the poisoning of our rivers and our air. Use whatever word you want about clean-up—use the nice words—but we're talking about poisoning the rivers and the air of America. That's what this bill does. When you take the Environmental Protection Agency and you take away its ability to protect us, then you are allowing poisons to be in our water and in our air and in our land.

You look at this bill, and you're talking about the extraordinary physical nature of America. Do you want the great mountains of the Appalachians to be flattened so you can have more coal to burn and then foul the atmosphere? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to take away the ability of this Nation to protect your precious Mojave Desert? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to allow those who would destroy by grabbing the resources of this Nation without even bothering to pay a decent royalty? That's what this bill does whether it's the oil in the gulf or the copper in a new mine in Arizona.

I've listened to the Republican bills day after day on this floor and in committee, and they would strip away the protections that Americans want for their health and for their land. That's not what we should be doing.

Do you want to know where the money is? My colleague from New Jersey said it very well:

It's in Afghanistan and it's in Baghdad. We're building the bridges. We're cleaning the rivers. We're providing the water and the electrical systems there to the tune of \$150 billion a year.

Bring our troops home. Bring our money back to America. Build America. Rebuild America. There is the answer. Not in this way will you ever solve the deficit.

By the way, this bill lays off people—15,000 people at the EPA alone. This bill will not build infrastructure. This bill will take away the infrastructure for our sanitation systems, for our water systems. That's what this bill does.

□ 1740

My colleague from California knows full good and well what's intended here. It's to give our resources to the polluters. It's to foul our air. It's to remove the ability of the people of America, not some government in Washington but the people of America, who have for the last 40 years demanded clean water, that their resources be protected, that the commons be protected. It is the people of America that want a future that's good for their children, that want a future that's viable, that want a future that does not have poisoned water and air. That's what the people of America want. This bill goes exactly the wrong direction.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal 2012 Interior and Environmental appropriations bill.

I do want to start on a positive note. The bill would restore the President's proposed cuts to mitigation fish hatcheries. That's a good thing. It would increase funding for the Indian Health Service, and it would largely maintain funding for the National Park Service operations and the Smithsonian. So I commend the subcommittee for those decisions.

But I'm afraid the list of positive things is pretty short. So I want to, in the time I have, list some of the devastating cuts that this bill includes. And while our friend from California has suggested that these really aren't deep cuts, I believe the content of this bill belies that notion.

The bill before us picks up where H.R. 1 left off last spring making numerous and deep cuts to the programs that protect our air, water, public lands, and wildlife. Here are just a couple of the most egregious cuts in this bill:

First to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This funds the acquisition of public lands so they're protected from development and can be enjoyed by future generations. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a dedicated revenue stream from offshore drilling royalties. It takes nothing from the General Fund. And yet this bill would cut Land and Water Conservation funding by 80 percent—the lowest level for the program in 45 years.

It threatens completion of the acquisition of the Rocky Fork tract in Tennessee and several treasures in North Carolina that need protection. Every Member of this body should ask: How many acquisition projects would this halt in my State? There is no reassuring answer.

Secondly, the Environmental Protection Agency, the bill continues the Republican majority's assault on the EPA. After imposing a 16 percent cut in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further 18 percent reduction in the agency's budget. That would push agency staffing to 1991 levels. The goal of a cut so massive is plain and simple: to ensure that the EPA doesn't have the resources it needs to fulfill its core mission, and that mission includes lifesaving and life-enhancing research, largely based in my district, that Research Triangle park.

Third, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. The SRFs provide funding directly to the States to fund water infrastructure projects that enable communities to better manage wastewater and polluted runoff and to protect clean and safe drinking

water. This provides one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. And yet this bill would cut funding for these two programs by nearly a billion dollars combined.

Given how essential water supply is to economic growth, this is ironic at this particular time as our communities struggle to retain and regain jobs. I suggest to colleagues, ask your State and local governments how they're going to make up this difference.

Mr. Chairman, as if these cuts weren't bad enough, the majority has loaded this bill with legislative policy riders and funding limitations that will roll back 40 years of progress towards clean air and clean water.

These anti-environmental riders have no place in an appropriations bill. They will not save the country a penny, and they will cost tens of thousands of lives. They will expose our children, families, and communities to unnecessary illnesses, and they will degrade our irreplaceable natural resources.

The majority claims that these cuts are needed to demonstrate fiscal discipline. Mr. Chairman, this book is a textbook case in false economies. In gutting critical environmental protection programs, it piles up frightful economic and human costs for the future.

Our constituents and our environment today and in future generations deserve better than what this bill is offering. I urge my colleagues to oppose this shortsighted appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Well, congratulations. This is probably the most radical anti-environment bill that the House of Representatives has ever considered. It cuts open space funding to the lowest level in a half a century. It opens the Grand Canyon to uranium mining. It denies the existence of climate change and eliminates funding for Federal agencies to monitor and adapt to it. It contains more than three dozen anti-environment policy riders that eviscerate the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other landmark environmental statutes.

The bill desecrates the legacy of Teddy Roosevelt and a long line of bipartisan conservation leaders while it also endangers public health.

The Republican majority claims to be concerned about spending, but this reckless bill will impose billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, of health care costs on Americans by increasing the incidence of asthma, emphysema, heart attacks, and even premature death. This anti-environmental bill will increase health care costs by up to \$539 billion according to the Congressional Research Service. Since Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP are responsible for 33.9 percent of total health care costs,

this Republican bill will cost taxpayers some \$179 billion more.

In addition, it will cause more than 60,000 premature deaths, 20 million lost days of work, and 36,800 additional heart attacks in America.

This bill eliminates funding for critical and conservation priorities, completely defunding the Forest Legacy program. It defunds the Chesapeake Bay Restoration program. It blocks Environmental Protection Agency implementation of public health standards for particulate, lead, greenhouse gas and other pollutants. It allows the unregulated destruction of one of America's two most biodiverse regions, southern Appalachia, by repealing Clean Water Act standards to protect streams from mountaintop removal.

It imperils the cleanliness of public drinking water by allowing unregulated disposal of coal, waste, and pesticides, and casts into regulatory purgatory developers and others seeking clarity of Clean Water Act regulations.

The Republican majority seems to be living in an alternative reality. As Americans face unprecedented drought in the Southwest, record floods in the Mississippi basin, record heat here in eastern and midwestern cities, accelerating sea level rises, and other symptoms of global warming, this bill blocks funding even to monitor global warming. Not only do the Republicans deny the existence of global warming, apparently, they have even blocked funding to monitor its impacts.

This reckless policy rider doesn't just endanger polar bears, coral reefs, and countless other species and ecosystems; it endangers American infrastructure from the Norfolk Naval Base to the Jefferson Memorial.

It endangers public health by increasing smog pollution and heat-related deaths, as we've seen from the recent heat wave that swept across the east and midwest United States, setting record temperatures here in Washington, D.C., Newark, and other cities across this eastern seaboard.

I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless legislation that defunds critical public lands programs, eviscerates 40 years of bipartisan environmental standards, and desecrates the memory of Teddy Roosevelt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1750

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, our country is facing an incredibly important moment as critical decisions need to be made regarding the national debt and our long-term deficit and how to constrain spending. Members on both sides of this aisle recognize the reality that we need to restore fiscal responsibility in our budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, in times of national importance, we need to stay

focused on what our country needs and what's best for the American people and avoid the temptation to play politics, as this bill does.

Far too much has been carried out by the majority party under the guise of cutting the deficit and fiscal responsibility when it's actually policy-making to implement a hard right, radical, anti-environmental agenda which can actually cost more money in the short, medium, and long term.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts proposed by the majority in this bill have nothing to do with fiscal responsibility. They have everything to do with implementing radical anti-environmental ideology. The bill makes sweeping cuts to critical programs that protect the public's health, reduce our expenditures for health care, protect our environment, and keep industry from running over the public and consumer rights.

Yet at the same time it does that, Mr. Chairman, this bill actually increases spending on programs that are little more than handouts and subsidies to oil and gas companies and mining companies, in particular, one that the government waste watchdog group Taxpayers for Common Sense has called "the granddaddy of Federal subsidies." This isn't about saving taxpayer money in this bill; it's about slashing environmental protections while giving handouts and subsidizing the dirtiest, most influential industries.

There's more pork in this bill than in an Iowa hog lot. This is supposed to be a spending bill that attempts to balance various budget priorities against one another. It's not supposed to be a grab bag of provisions demanded by the Nation's worst polluters, energy companies, and other special interests who receive handouts under this bill.

Yes, this bill would do away with the Clean Water Act, putting the rest of us in danger because mountaintop coal mining companies and factory farms want it. This bill does away with key provisions of the Clean Air Act, undermines protections of our public lands, and repeals the Endangered Species Act to satisfy a few at the expense of the many.

The bill will put more toxic mercury, arsenic, and lead into our air and put our children's health at risk by blocking standards to cut toxic air pollution from cement kilns, allow more soot pollution in our air, block EPA from moving forward with carbon pollution standards for new vehicles after 2016, jeopardizing a process projected to create up to 700,000 new jobs and save 2.4 million barrels of oil every day by 2030.

States would also be blocked from moving ahead with their own clean car standards, threatening the health of America's children, elderly citizens, and other vulnerable populations by blocking EPA's ability to limit dangerous carbon pollution from power plants and other large stationary sources.

This bill also expedites uranium mining in the Grand Canyon, gives special legal exemption to grazing on public lands, eliminates endangered species protections for animals from big horned sheep to grey wolves, and more. Yet it increases spending for the 1879 mining law and other elements that actually threaten to endanger our environment and are an additional handout to Big Oil.

Mr. Chairman, this bill isn't a serious funding proposal. It's a polluter's wish list of subsidies, handouts, and pork. The majority can call it what they will, but don't say that this bill serves the cause of cut-cutting while it lards up programs that are little more than a subsidy to wealthy mining and drilling interests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 19, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is increase the funding for our Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement by \$5 million. And what it would do is it would allow BOEMRE to quicken the pace of permit approval and, in turn, promote the rate of oil and gas investment in the gulf region. To accomplish this, we will reduce the Rangeland Management Fund by \$6 million, which still leaves that fund above its fiscal year 2011 funding level.

Let me point out to you why this is the wise thing to do. In response to the Deepwater Horizon explosion and the resulting oil spill last year, in May, the administration issued a temporary moratorium, halting permits of oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf. The moratorium was lifted in October of last year; but since then, the issuance of permits has been slow. President Obama directed BOEMRE to reorganize itself into two independent groups: one that handles revenue from oil and gas leasing, and the other that regulates the oil and gas industry. This is all a change that most of us believe is necessary and wise.

However, the speed of permitting activity has not returned to pre-Deepwater Horizon levels. There is a significant and growing backlog of drilling plans pending approval. The number of pending deepwater exploration and development plans has increased by more than 250 percent. This is up from a historical average of 18 plans pending to now nearly 65 pending approval.

Also there's a drastic decline in drilling permit approvals. Deepwater exploration and development drilling permit

approvals have also declined by approximately 80 percent, down from an average of nearly 160 per year to a pace of only 30 per year. Shallow water exploration and development drilling permits approvals have also dropped by nearly 50 percent from an average of 390 per year to a pace of fewer than 180 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you that there was a recent study that showed that increasing the pace of permitting and, subsequently, the pace and scale of investment in the gulf would create 230,000 domestic jobs in 2012 as well as more than \$44 billion in U.S. gross domestic product.

I just want to focus on that number for a second, Mr. Chairman, because as we have been here for the 112th Congress, the American people have been demanding that we use the money we have efficiently so that we can invest in the American people and get a return on our investment. So here we are asking the American people for \$5 million and are asking our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who earlier this year proposed legislation that was purported to increase drilling and to lower gas prices. Well, now they have the opportunity to take \$5 million, invest it in BOEMRE, and have the opportunity to create 230,000 jobs.

There are 14.1 million people in this country who are actively seeking employment and cannot find it. Here we have a chance to help 230,000 of them in fiscal year 2012 alone, and we have the ability to increase our gross domestic product by \$44 million.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's what the American people are demanding. They want us to use our money wisely. That's what this amendment does. And I will just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this. It's a job creation amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. LATOURETTE. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment would take \$6 million from BLM's Lands and Resources and transfer it to BOEMRE. The BLM's management account has already been cut \$43.5 million below fiscal year 11, \$15.5 million below the President's request. This fund allows the BLM to take care of more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres; further cuts to this account would not be warranted.

I want to commend the gentleman for the location where he wants to send the money. I have no big opposition to the increase in the BOEMRE spending. But we did the best we could to balance this particular piece of legislation. BOEMRE has already been increased by \$37 million above fiscal year 2011. It's also been increased significantly in several continuing resolutions. Therefore, because of the location of the off-

set, I urge our colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,617,000)".

Page 10, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,617,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1800

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, again I rise to talk about what I consider to be wise investments into the future and the stability of this great country.

For the last 21 years, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has created jobs and served as an important investment tool in our Nation's economy and for wetlands in every single State. NAWCA has been responsible for restoring over 26 million acres of wetlands, equivalent to the size of the State of Ohio. Not only did it restore over 26 million acres, it also creates nearly 7,500 jobs annually and hundreds of millions in worker earnings every year.

If we look at the fiscal year 2011 appropriations with \$37.5 million, it is down from \$47.6 million for fiscal year 2010. This bill allocates only \$20 million for fiscal year '12, a cut of 47 percent from fiscal year '11 levels and 58 percent from fiscal year '10 levels.

Here is the important point, Mr. Chairman: The law requires that each Federal dollar put into the program be matched by \$1 in non-Federal funds. Because the competition for these dollars is so great, on average, each Federal dollar is matched 3 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, over and over again I keep saying that the American people are looking for us to spend money in this great country, where we get a return on our investment. Now we have another program where, for every dollar we spend on this program, the American people get \$3. That's what we should be doing in this time of great economic hardship.

I am asking my colleagues on the other side to look at where we're spending money in this bill and put money where we're going to get a good

return on our investment, we're going to create jobs, and at the same time we're going to preserve and restore our wetlands.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think, is the responsible thing to do, the wise thing to do, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

I would now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

I rise in support of the Richmond amendment and in opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior and Environment appropriations, and I do so because we cannot afford to make such drastic cuts to programs that benefit our Nation's drinking water, deplete our air pollution standards, and reduce the beautiful landscape.

For example, in Illinois, where I live, the drinking water systems face a required investment of \$13.5 billion over the next 20 years to replace aging facilities and comply with safe drinking regulations. In 2009, total Federal funding for drinking water was less than \$3 billion, which included a one-time \$2 billion infusion of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Within Cook County, a large portion of my district, we can take only half an inch of rainwater before flooding takes place. This means sewer water and other contaminants flood both the streets and homes. We cannot afford to reduce the health and safety of our citizens, and we cannot disrupt our environment.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding, urge support of his amendment, and urge that we defeat the overall appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that this is another one of my small attempts to make an awful bill just a little bit better, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his amendment, but he again targets the account that we talked about in the last amendment, and that is the Bureau of Land Management's land and resources account which, as I indicated during the last amendment, is already cut by \$43½ million below the fiscal year '11 level and \$15½ million below the President's request.

In addition, this time the gentleman attempts to reach the Secretary's account and wants to reduce it by \$6.8 million. Nobody likes to stand up for bureaucrats or the Secretaries around here, but that account has already

been cut by \$33½ million. Any further reductions could impede the new Office of Natural Resource Revenue, which collects royalties for on- and offshore oil and gas production, which I know is so important to our friends in the minority.

For those reasons, again not because of the place where the gentleman wants to put the additional funds but because of where they come from, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

Page 3, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment is going to have appeal for both sides of the aisle. I have sat here and listened for some time, particularly on the Republican side, about the need to be cutting our expenses. Well, my amendment does just that.

My amendment actually removes \$4.4 million in spending increases and returns those very funds to deficit reduction. Those of us who also believe that the taxpayers should not hand over an additional \$4.4 million just to help out the oil and gas industry would also support this amendment.

What my amendment does is remove a \$4.4 million increase in funding for oil and gas management. I just cannot stand here and support an additional increase in taxpayer spending at a time when the other parts of this budget are being slashed.

Forgive me today if I don't have a lot of sympathy for Big Oil. Last quarter, Exxon posted \$11.4 billion in profits, in one quarter alone, Mr. Chairman. Royal Dutch Shell posted over \$6 billion profit in one quarter alone. The additional \$4.4 million added to help out the oil and gas companies to cover their permit application processing is literally pocket change for these big companies.

We live in tough economic times, and we all came to Congress to make tough decisions. We need to cut spending. That's why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment and cut this spending increase.

My amendment, I assure you, does not address the merits of drilling whatsoever. This is simply an issue of fairness for the taxpayers. In times of government austerity and record profits for oil companies, this amendment is a

simple statement that these companies should pay for the administrative expenses associated with processing their applications.

Some people don't have a problem asking our seniors, our families, and our small businesses to pay more during these tough times. Well, I do. I think it is fundamentally unfair to increase spending in their areas while at the same time we are hurting our seniors. Almost every other area of this bill is being slashed, but the one that greases the skids for oil companies to get their approval is being increased over last year's budget. Something is just not right with our national priorities, and I believe that reasonable Democrats and Republicans will agree.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern for the budget deficit and reducing the budget deficit, but I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would limit the BLM from spending \$4.5 million of offsetting collections for the processing of application of permits to drill. The BLM still collects the fees, they just wouldn't be able to spend the funds.

Mr. Chairman, this makes little sense as those fees offset the cost to administer the oil and gas permitting program. In other words, these programs are paid for by the industry, not by taxpayers. In other words, the BLM will have the cost of these programs but won't be allowed to spend the fees it has collected.

So I have a problem with this amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

□ 1810

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri.

An amendment by Mr. RICHMOND of Louisiana.

An amendment by Ms. HOCHUL of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 237, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

AYES—175

Ackerman	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Gutierrez	Payne
Baca	Hahn	Pelosi
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Higgins	Polis
Berkley	Himes	Posey
Berman	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Inslee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jenkins	T.
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Jones	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Schrader
Clay	Kildee	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott, David
Cole	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sires
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Speier
Cummings	Loebach	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luján	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney	Tierney
Deutch	Markey	Tipton
Dicks	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McIntyre	Velázquez
Ellison	McNerney	Visclosky
Engel	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Michaud	Wasserman
Farr	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt
Finer	Moore	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wu
Gosar	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Pallone	
Green, Gene	Pascrell	

NOES—237

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Olson
Aderholt	Gohmert	Owens
Akin	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Alexander	Gowdy	Paul
Altmire	Granger	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Barletta	Grimm	Petri
Bartlett	Guinta	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Platts
Bass (NH)	Hall	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hanna	Pompeo
Biggert	Harper	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Harris	Quayle
Billirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Black	Hayworth	Reichert
Blackburn	Heck	Renacci
Bonner	Hensarling	Ribble
Bono Mack	Herger	Rigell
Boswell	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Boustany	Huelskamp	Roby
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jordan	Roskam
Campbell	Kelly	Ross (AR)
Canseco	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Kingston	Royce
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Cardoza	Kissell	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kline	Scalise
Cassidy	Labrador	Schilling
Chabot	Lamborn	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Lance	Schock
Coble	Landry	Schweikert
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Conaway	Latham	Scott, Austin
Costa	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Cravaack	Latta	Sessions
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cuellar	Long	Simpson
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
DesJarlais	E.	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Stivers
Dold	Marchant	Stutzman
Dreier	Marino	Sullivan
Duffy	Matheson	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thornberry
Ellmers	McClintock	Tiberi
Emerson	McCotter	Turner
Farenthold	McHenry	Upton
Fincher	McKeon	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walden
Flake	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Webster
Fleming	Meehan	West
Flores	Mica	Westmoreland
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Galleghy	Myrick	Woodall
Gardner	Neugebauer	Yoder
Garrett	Noem	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gibbs	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gibson	Nunnelee	

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann	DeFazio	Mack
Berg	Dingell	McDermott
Boren	Giffords	Oliver
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)	Richardson
Buchanan	Hinchey	Shuler
Cohen	King (IA)	Waters
Costello	Lynch	

□ 1837

Messrs. CASSIDY, BOSWELL, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. COLE, Ms. JENKINS, Messrs. PERLMUTTER, HOLDEN, SCHRA-

DER, DONNELLY of Indiana, and PAYNE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 284, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

AYES—126

Adams	Graves (GA)	Olson
Akin	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Amash	Guinta	Paul
Bachus	Hall	Pearce
Bartlett	Harper	Pence
Benishek	Harris	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Black	Hensarling	Pompeo
Blackburn	Herger	Posey
Boustany	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Brooks	Hultgren	Renacci
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Ribble
Buerkle	Hurt	Rigell
Burgess	Issa	Roe (TN)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cassidy	Jordan	Rooney
Chabot	Kingston	Roskam
Chaffetz	Kline	Ross (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Labrador	Royce
Conaway	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Landry	Scalise
DesJarlais	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Flake	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Marchant	Southerland
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Flores	McCaul	Stutzman
Forbes	McHenry	Sullivan
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Fox	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Webster
Galleghy	Myrick	Westmoreland
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Nugent	Woodall
Gerlach	Nunes	Yoder
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Young (IN)

NOES—284

Ackerman	Bilbray	Capuano
Aderholt	Billirakis	Cardoza
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Carnahan
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carney
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carson (IN)
Austria	Bonner	Carter
Baca	Bono Mack	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Boswell	Chandler
Barletta	Brady (PA)	Chu
Barrow	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Barton (TX)	Bucshon	Clarke (MI)
Bass (CA)	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Bass (NH)	Calvert	Clay
Becerra	Camp	Cleaver
Berkley	Cantor	Clyburn
Berman	Capito	Coble
Biggert	Capps	Cole

Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Conyers	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Costa	Jones	Reyes
Courtney	Kaptur	Richmond
Cravaack	Keating	Rivera
Crawford	Kelly	Roby
Crenshaw	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Critz	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Crowley	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (AR)
Cummings	Kissell	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Lance	Runyan
Davis (KY)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Latham	Sánchez, Linda
Dent	Lee (CA)	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff
Dold	LoBiondo	Schilling
Donnelly (IN)	Loebback	Schmidt
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Schock
Dreier	Lowey	Schrader
Duffy	Lucas	Schwartz
Edwards	Lujan	Schweikert
Ellison	Lummis	Scott (VA)
Ellmers	Lungren, Daniel	Scott, David
Emerson	E.	Serrano
Engel	Lynch	Sewell
Eshoo	Maloney	Sherman
Farr	Marino	Shimkus
Fattah	Markey	Simpson
Filner	Matheson	Sires
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Slaughter
Fortenberry	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Frank (MA)	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Fudge	McCotter	Speier
Galleghy	McGovern	Stark
Garamendi	McIntyre	Stivers
Gardner	McKeon	Sutton
Gerlach	McKinley	Terry
Gibson	McMorris	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez	Rodgers	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	McNerney	Thompson (PA)
Granger	Meehan	Tiberi
Green, Al	Meeks	Tierney
Green, Gene	Mica	Tipton
Griffin (AR)	Michaud	Tonko
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Towns
Grimm	Miller, George	Tsongas
Guthrie	Moran	Turner
Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)	Upton
Hahn	Murphy (PA)	Van Hollen
Hanabusa	Nadler	Velázquez
Hanna	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Walden
Hastings (WA)	Noem	Walz (MN)
Hayworth	Owens	Wasserman
Heck	Pallone	Schultz
Heinrich	Pascarell	Watt
Herrera Beutler	Pastor (AZ)	Waxman
Higgins	Paulsen	Payne
Himes	Payne	Welch
Hinojosa	Pelosi	West
Hirono	Perlmutter	Whitfield
Hochul	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Holden	Peterson	Wittman
Holt	Petri	Wolf
Honda	Pingree (ME)	Womack
Hoyer	Platts	Woolsey
Inslee	Polis	Wu
Israel	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Jackson (IL)	Quigley	Young (AK)
Jackson Lee	Rahall	Young (FL)
(TX)	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann	Dingell	Moore
Berg	Giffords	Oliver
Boren	Graves (MO)	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Shuler
Buchanan	King (IA)	Shuster
Cohen	LaTourette	Waters
Costello	Mack	
DeFazio	McDermott	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1844

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

AYES—165

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Andrews	Hahn	Payne
Baca	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Peters
Becerra	Higgins	Petri
Berkley	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hinojosa	Polis
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Quigley
Blumenauer	Holt	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Honda	Reichert
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Rush
Carney	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Johnson (IL)	T.
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schwartz
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Cooper	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis (CA)	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
DeGette	Lowey	Sutton
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Maloney	Tierney
Deutch	Markey	Tonko
Dicks	Matsui	Towns
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dold	McCollum	Upton
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Filner	Moran	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Neal	Wu
Green, Al	Pallone	Yarmuth

NOES—248

Adams	Akin	Altmire
Aderholt	Alexander	Amash

Austria	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Green, Gene
Barletta	Griffin (AR)
Barrow	Griffith (VA)
Bartlett	Grijalva
Barton (TX)	Grimm
Bass (NH)	Guinta
Benishke	Guthrie
Biggert	Hall
Bilbray	Hanna
Bilirakis	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Harris
Black	Hartzler
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Hayworth
Bono Mack	Heck
Boswell	Hensarling
Boustany	Herger
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler
Brooks	Holden
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)
Buerkle	Hultgren
Burgess	Hunter
Burton (IN)	Hurt
Calvert	Issa
Camp	Jenkins
Campbell	Johnson (OH)
Canseco	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Jones
Capito	Jordan
Cardoza	Kelly
Carter	King (NY)
Cassidy	Kingston
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Kissell
Coble	Kline
Coffman (CO)	Labrador
Cole	Lamborn
Conaway	Lance
Costa	Landry
Cravaack	Lankford
Crawford	Latham
Crenshaw	LaTourette
Critz	Latta
Cuellar	LoBiondo
Culberson	Long
Davis (KY)	Lucas
Denham	Luetkemeyer
DesJarlais	Luján
Diaz-Balart	Lummis
Donnelly (IN)	Lungren, Daniel
Dreier	E.
Duffy	Manzullo
Duncan (SC)	Marchant
Duncan (TN)	Marino
Elmiers	Matheson
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)
Farenthold	McCaul
Fincher	McClintock
Fitzpatrick	McCotter
Flake	McHenry
Fleischmann	McIntyre
Fleming	McKeon
Flores	McKinley
Forbes	McMorris
Fortenberry	Rodgers
Foxx	Meehan
Franks (AZ)	Mica
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Gallely	Miller (MI)
Gardner	Miller, Gary
Garrett	Mulvaney
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)
Gibbs	Myrick
Gibson	Neugebauer
Gingrey (GA)	Noem
Gohmert	Nugent
Goodlatte	Nunes
Gosar	Nunnelee
Gowdy	Olson
Granger	Owens

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	DeFazio
Berg	Dingell
Boren	Giffords
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Hinchee
Cohen	King (IA)
Costello	Mack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1850

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 192, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

AYES—221

Ackerman	Filner	Matsui
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (NY)
Altmire	Fleming	McCaul
Andrews	Flores	McCollum
Baca	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bachus	Fudge	McHenry
Baldwin	Garamendi	McIntyre
Barrow	Gerlach	McNerney
Bartlett	Gibbs	Meehan
Barton (TX)	Gibson	Meeks
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Mica
Becerra	Gonzalez	Michaud
Berkley	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Berman	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bishop (GA)	Grimm	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Moran
Blumenauer	Hahn	Mulvaney
Boswell	Hall	Murphy (CT)
Boustany	Hanabusa	Murphy (PA)
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Nadler
Brady (TX)	Harper	Napolitano
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Nugent
Butterfield	Himes	Nunnelee
Capps	Hinojosa	Owens
Capuano	Hirono	Palazzo
Cardoza	Hochul	Pallone
Carnahan	Holden	Pascarell
Carney	Holt	Paul
Carson (IN)	Honda	Payne
Cassidy	Hoyer	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Inslee	Peters
Chandler	Israel	Peterson
Cicilline	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Clarke (MI)	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Pitts
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Poe (TX)
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Posney
Clyburn	Jones	Price (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Jordan	Rangel
Conyers	Kaptur	Renacci
Cooper	Keating	Richmond
Cooper	Kildee	Rooney
Cravaack	Kind	Ross (AR)
Critz	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
Crowley	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Landry	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dent	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Deutch	Lee (CA)	T.
Dicks	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dold	Lipinski	Scalise
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Doyle	Loeb sack	Schiff
Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Schilling
Ellison	Lowey	Schwartz
Engel	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Maloney	Scott, David
Farr	Markey	Sensenbrenner
Fattah	Matheson	Serrano

Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan

Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)

Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson

Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
Berg
Boren
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Cohen
Costello

DeFazio
Dingell
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
King (IA)
Mack

McDermott
Olver
Richardson
Shuler
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1856

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 271, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

AYES—141

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connelly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gutierrez
Hahn

Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Sarbanes
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi

Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—271

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito

Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson

Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann
Berg
Boren
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Cohen
Costello

Crowley
DeFazio
Dingell
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
King (IA)

Mack
McDermott
Olver
Richardson
Shuler
Waters

□ 1903

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move
that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1938, NORTH AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-181) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FBI DIRECTOR EXTENSION ACT, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1103) to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1103

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) on May 12, 2011, the President requested that Congress extend the term of Robert S. Mueller III as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by 2 years, citing the critical need for continuity and stability at the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the face of ongoing threats to the United States and leadership transitions at the Federal agencies charged with protecting national security;

(2) in light of the May 1, 2011, successful operation against Osama bin Laden, the continuing threat to national security, and the approaching 10th anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the President's request for a limited, 1-time exception to the term limit of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in these exceptional circumstances, is appropriate; and

(3) this Act is intended to provide a 1-time exception to the 10-year statutory limit on the term of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in light of the President's request and existing exceptional cir-

cumstances, and is not intended to create a precedent.

SEC. 2. CREATION OF NEW TERM OF SERVICE FOR THE OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

Section 1101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (28 U.S.C. 532 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this subsection, a new term of service for the office of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be created, which shall begin on or after August 3, 2011, and continue until September 4, 2013. Notwithstanding the second sentence of subsection (b) of this section, the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection shall be eligible to be appointed to the new term of service provided for by this subsection, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and only for that new term of service. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, from appointing an individual, other than the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to a 10-year term of service subject to the provisions of subsection (b) after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(2) The individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection may not serve as Director after September 4, 2013.

“(3) With regard to the individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection, the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1103, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this September 11 marks the 10-year anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history. America is fortunate not to have suffered another attack of such magnitude and devastation in the past decade. America has remained safe but not because those who are determined to deny us our freedoms and destroy our way of life have given up. We are safe because of the men and women who serve our country with devotion and distinction—those who serve in our Armed Forces, our intelligence community, and our law enforcement agencies.

These public servants and their families make tremendous sacrifices to

keep us safe and to keep terrorists on the run. Their work is often unrecognized and underappreciated. In addition to ensuring that terrorists are denied victory, some of our public servants also protect us from crime and ensure that justice is served.

The agency that is charged with this unique duty is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI director is limited to a 10-year nonrenewable term. Congress imposed this restriction to ensure political independence and to act as a restraint on unbridled power and the potential for misuse of that power.

In just a few weeks, the current FBI director, Robert S. Mueller, III, will conclude his 10-year term. The President has asked for a one-time 2-year extension for Mr. Mueller to ensure continuity in America's national security team. The killing of Osama bin Laden and personnel changes in key national security posts make these unusual times that justify a short-term extension.

Director Mueller has shown himself a dedicated public servant who has kept terrorists at bay and reduced crime.

Mr. Mueller assumed leadership of the FBI on September 4, 2001, just 1 week prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001. During his tenure, he has reformed the FBI to ensure that it is able to address not only terrorist threats, but also threats posed by traditional criminals. This request for an extension was made not by Mr. Mueller but by the President of the United States.

Mr. Mueller has agreed to accept this extension if it is approved by Congress. It's not every day that the House, the Senate, and the White House can agree, but this is something we all can agree is essential.

This bill creates a new, one time only 2-year term of service for the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Mueller will be eligible to be appointed to this new term of service with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate will hold a confirmation vote after the President signs this bill.

This new term would expire on September 4, 2013, after which, Mr. Mueller would no longer serve as director. This bill does not prevent the President from appointing a different individual to a new tenured term by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

If the President wants to continue the services of the incumbent, this bill allows that to happen for a limited time and in a constitutional manner. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to continue the service of FBI Director Robert S. Mueller, III, for an additional 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1910

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the committee in support of the

Senate bill that would allow for the extension of the term of FBI Director Robert Mueller whose 10-year term expires on August 2.

On May 12 of this year, President Obama announced his desire to extend that term by 2 years. At the time, the President said, "In his 10 years at the FBI, Bob Mueller has set the gold standard for leading the bureau. Given the ongoing threats facing the United States, as well as the leadership transitions at other agencies like the Defense Department and Central Intelligence Agency, I believe continuity and stability at the FBI is critical at this time."

I agree with the President's remarks, and I am confident that Director Mueller will continue to work with integrity and respect for Americans' rights as he ensures the safety of the American people. The Nation needs, now as much as at any time in our history, an FBI that is capable of a multifaceted mission to best protect us from a variety of criminal threats, which has been proven under Mueller's leadership. I congratulate him on his noteworthy 10-year term and look forward to continuing to work with him and with the Committee on the Judiciary.

The job of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is critical, and that agency must have experienced and capable leadership. There are many threats which the FBI must concentrate its limited resources on, ranging from interstate violent crime, organized crime, human trafficking, exploitation of children, corporate fraud, mortgage fraud, cybercrime, and domestic terrorism.

As time advances, so do the demands we place on the FBI and its agents across the country. We appreciate the difficulty the Director must face when determining how to allocate resources. As these demands grow and the nature of the threats evolve, I hope the FBI will maintain an appropriate degree of focus on the types of crime that impact average Americans every day, whether it be fraud against seniors, corporate officers defrauding investors, civil rights violations by those who abuse power, theft of individual identities, or electronic intrusions into people's privacy.

Director Mueller is the right person to continue to lead the Federal Bureau of Investigation in confronting these challenges at this time. He has proven himself to be honest, frank, and committed to the rule of law.

While this extension is unusual, it is important that we grant it so that we have continuity in the leadership of the FBI at this critical time. I urge support of this important measure.

I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished Member from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I want to join my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, on which I also serve, to note the uniqueness of our times. There's a

point that I think is very important about the continuity of existing FBI Director Mueller; and that is that we live not only in dangerous times, but we also live in times where resources are being strained. Questions are being raised about the resources necessary for law enforcement; and certainly a leader who understands the broad needs of the American public and the collaborative needs, collaborating with other law enforcement because of past experiences, is very important.

Mr. Mueller, in his 10 years, has had collaborative efforts with all of the Federal law enforcement agencies and has opened up a dialogue between local and State law enforcement agencies. Just ask New York to tell you how important that is; ask Texas or a number of our other large States with assets that are in the eye of the storm of potential terrorist acts.

So I join with my colleagues and acknowledge the leadership of the President for asking the FBI Director to stay for 2 extra years and that this does not undermine the 10-year term that is by law. I ask colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1103, a bill to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Director Robert Mueller has shown extraordinary leadership, and made fundamental changes to the FBI for the better protection of the American people.

Director Mueller has a long and distinguished history of public service. After completing college, he joined the United States Marine Corps, and is a decorated Vietnam veteran. Director Mueller served as the Chief of the Criminal Division in the U.S. Attorney's office in San Francisco, and prosecuted cases of financial fraud, corruption and terrorism as the Assistant U.S. Attorney in Boston, before being named U.S. Attorney in San Francisco.

President Bush nominated Mr. Mueller as the sixth FBI Director on September 4, 2001, just one week prior to the attacks of September 11. Director Mueller has since led the Bureau in modernizing its approach to law enforcement, and developed an intelligence driven organization with a focus on prevention. By centralizing intelligence management, and coordinating intelligence and counterterrorism efforts, Director Mueller has improved the effectiveness of his agency.

Over the last ten years, Director Mueller has overseen the transformation of the FBI, from a reactive investigatory agency, to a far more proactive bureau that uses intelligence to seek out threats before they materialize. His visionary leadership has increased collaboration between the FBI and other intelligence gathering agencies, including foreign partners, established partnerships between the bureau, businesses, private industry stakeholders, and the general public, and greatly increased communication between FBI field offices and state and local law enforcement bodies.

During his tenure leading the agency, Director Mueller has increased resources to combat the threat of terrorism, without neglecting its other duties. Just last week, the FBI arrested 16 individuals for engaging in cyber attacks. Last Thursday, the FBI, along with the Drug Enforcement Agency, and other Federal law

enforcement bodies, arrested over 70 individuals connected with La Familia Michoacana, one of the most violent drug trafficking organizations in Mexico. Additionally, in the past week, FBI efforts led to indictments on charges of drug trafficking, international kidnapping and coercion, and human trafficking.

Under Director Mueller's leadership, the FBI has made unprecedented improvements to face the challenges of hatred and global terrorism; the agency has thwarted a plot to detonate a bomb in the Sears Tower, arrested individuals engaged in a massive recruiting effort to attract young people to jihadist groups, and stopped an attack on Fort Dix. Director Mueller and his agency have achieved these, and a litany of other accomplishments, without asking for applause or recognition.

The FBI is America's primary federal agency responsible for investigating and preventing acts of terrorism. Now, more than ever, when we are faced with aggression from an enemy intent on destroying our way of life, the leader of the FBI must be able to meet the challenges ahead. The future of our nation is not entirely of our choosing; we are faced with an assault on our principles and freedoms we did not seek to galvanize, and a confrontation with intolerance and evil we did not expect. With strategic and forward looking leaders like Director Mueller, we will overcome these challenges.

As a senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I agree with the President's recommendation that extending Director Mueller's term for two additional years will greatly benefit our national security. I am pleased at the bipartisan support that this legislation has received.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1103.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORING GI BILL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1383) to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 10 and 11 and insert the following:

Code, who, since January 4, 2011, has been enrolled in the same non-public institution of higher learning in a State in

Beginning on page 4, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 5, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 3729(b)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “January 1, 2004” and inserting “October 1, 2011”; and

(B) by striking “3.00” both places it appears and inserting “3.30”;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “January 1, 2004, and before October 1, 2011” and inserting “October 1, 2011, and before October 1, 2012”; and

(B) by striking “3.30” both places it appears and inserting “2.80”; and

(3) in clause (iii), by striking “October 1, 2011” and inserting “October 1, 2012”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1383, as amended, the Restoring GI Bill Fairness Act of 2011. The bill would temporarily restore the Post-9/11 GI Bill program's original method of paying tuition and fees to veterans attending private schools in several States.

When the original Post-9/11 GI Bill was enacted, veterans were promised that the VA would pay 100 percent of tuition and fees up to a State's most expensive instate undergraduate tuition and fee charges at a public institution of higher learning. The State-based cap applied to veterans who chose both public and private schools. What this meant to some veterans attending schools in certain States was tuition and fee payments could be well in excess of \$20,000 annually. Veterans applied and enrolled in these schools based on that original promise.

However, in an effort to “fix” some elements of the original GI Bill, Congress left those veterans in a bind. The Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, which was enacted on January 4, 2011, made several changes. And one of those changes included a national cap of \$17,500 on tuition and fee payments for veterans attending private schools, a change that will go into effect 1 week from today. For veterans that were enrolled in certain private schools in several States, including New York, Texas, Arizona, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, this change has real consequences. They will see their tuition and fee payments reduced by thousands of dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, I just don't think that's fair.

We shouldn't change the rules on these veterans when they had already

decided to attend the school of their choice and made financial decisions based on those rules. On May 23, the House unanimously voted to keep the original promise made to these veterans in H.R. 1383. The Senate has now acted on that bill, and we're ready to finish the job and send the bill to the President before these cuts can take place.

□ 1920

Similar to the original House measure, the Senate amendment would temporarily restore the cap on tuition and fees to the State-based method effective on August 1, 2011. This increase would apply only to veterans who were enrolled in nonpublic institutions of higher learning in the seven States that I mentioned previously before the 4th of January of 2011—in other words, they had to have already been enrolled on the 4th of January of this year—a change from the House-passed version which was actually April 1 of 2011. Veterans who initially enrolled after January 4, 2011, would be subject to the new cap.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to our attention that some veterans are concerned about the January 4 eligibility date. We have talked with VA. They have assured us that any veteran who has applied and was accepted to a school on or before the 4th of January of 2011 will be covered under this particular bill we are considering on the floor today. Veterans who applied or were accepted after that date will be grandfathered under H.R. 1383.

I believe VA's interpretation of the bill accurately reflects the House's intent. I would note that this bill, as amended, passed the Senate unanimously, and, of course, it passed this body unanimously as well.

I reserve the balance of my time and would encourage a positive vote by all my colleagues.

Mr. FILNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 1383, as amended. I thank Chairman MILLER for the work he has done on the bill to make sure it was palatable in both the House and the Senate.

Let me just say, though, for the record, the GI Bill updates which we passed last Congress were passed with the full support of virtually every veterans service organization in the Nation, the majority of which submitted letters of support and strongly advocated for the bill, which included this tuition cap which we have been talking about. Everyone was well aware of the effect of the tuition cap, so I was sort of surprised when these same folks started talking about what they called “unintended consequences.” I think everybody knew the consequences.

I know that many of our veterans made plans about their education based on the laws in effect before they started. And while most States ended up getting an increase with the new national average, a few States also saw a

decrease. It is in these States that H.R. 1383, as amended, seeks to hold harmless our veterans from the so-called “unintended consequences” of the tuition cap.

Our veterans have indeed, as Chairman MILLER pointed out, earned their education benefits, and I firmly believe that we should seek to avoid any actions that may interfere with the use of their benefits. I am pleased that we are here today taking action to alleviate this potential burden on a small population of these student veterans. The start of the new school year, of course, is right around the corner, so I hope that with our quick action today we will have this issue solved in time for the new academic year.

We have made quite a few changes to improve the so-called Post-9/11 GI Bill, and more changes are still being contemplated. As a veterans' committee and as a Congress, we must continue to work hard to ensure future changes do not delay or diminish benefits. Veterans are our priority, and we will protect their interests.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendments to H.R. 1383.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I have no further requests for time.

Once again, I encourage all Members to support my motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1383.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF
TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-46)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat that significant transnational criminal organizations pose to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Organized crime is no longer a local or regional problem; it has become a danger to international stability. Significant transnational criminal organizations have become increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States, and their activities have reached such scope and gravity that they destabilize the international system. These groups have taken advantage of globalization and other factors to diversify their geographic scope and range of activities. They have increased and deepened their ties to governments and the international financial system, relying not only on bribery and violence, but also more and more on the ability to exploit differences among countries and to create and maintain legal facades to hide illicit activities.

The specific harms that significant transnational criminal organizations threaten today are many. They corrupt—and in some cases co-opt—governments, thereby destabilizing them and weakening democratic institutions and the rule of law. They threaten U.S. economic interests by subverting, exploiting, and distorting legitimate markets, and could gain influence in strategic sectors of the world economy.

Significant transnational criminal organizations that engage in cybercrime threaten sensitive public and private computer networks, undermine the integrity of the international financial system, and impose costs on the American consumer. Those that engage in the theft of intellectual property not only erode U.S. competitiveness, but also endanger the public health and safety through the distribution of tainted and counterfeit goods. Many of them also engage in drug trafficking.

Finally, significant transnational criminal organizations increasingly support the activities of other dangerous persons. Some of these organizations are involved in arms smuggling, which can facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts. Others are involved in human smuggling, exacerbating the problem of forced labor. There is also evidence of growing ties between significant transnational criminal organizations and terrorists.

The Executive Order I have issued today is one part of a comprehensive strategy to address the growing threat of transnational organized crime. The order targets significant transnational criminal organizations and the networks that support them, striking at the core of those networks—their abil-

ity and need to move money. It does this by blocking the property and interests in property of four transnational criminal organizations, listed in the Annex to the order, that currently pose significant threats to U.S. domestic and foreign economic interests, as well as to U.S. promotion of transparency and stability in the international political and financial systems. The order provides criteria for the further blocking of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State:

to be a foreign person that constitutes a significant transnational criminal organization;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

The order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on July 25, 2011. All executive agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2011.

RECOGNIZING BARRY WONENBERG

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Kennedy observed that "the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization."

I ask you to join me today in recognizing Barry Wonenberg, an artist in the Northern Mariana Islands, who very much embodies the ideal of which the President spoke, and who, through his avocations as both artist and educator, has, for more than 20 years, broadened our community's appreciation of art, creativity, and culture—and encouraged others to explore, and achieve in, artistic endeavors as well.

Today, Barry is representing the United States at the 12th International

Sculpture Symposium in Changchun, China. Artists from 96 different countries are creating sculptures there which will be added to some 500 sculptures already exhibited in that city from previous symposia. We all watch the progress on the massive clay sculpture Barry is creating, wish him well, and thank him for representing the Northern Marianas and America with such distinction.

Fifty years ago, President Kennedy observed that "the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization." I ask you to join me today in recognizing Barry Wonenberg, an artist in the Northern Mariana Islands who very much embodies the ideal of which the President spoke, and who, through his avocations as both artist and educator has, for more than 20 years, broadened our community's appreciation of art, creativity, and culture—and encouraged others to explore, and achieve in, artistic endeavors as well.

Barry came to the Commonwealth in 1989 under an artist-in-residence contract and he initially aided in the design of lesson plans and textbooks for the local public school system, including the first-ever Northern Marianas History textbook. Not long thereafter, Barry accepted a teaching position at Northern Marianas College, where he developed a ceramics program and has assisted in the development of other arts-related curricula.

Barry's true passion as an artist, and the area in which he has inspired most students, though, remains sculpture and pottery—which he has been crafting for 35 years. As in most cultures around the world, these arts represent a tangible link to our local historical past. The mediums also inspire exploration, consideration, and interpretation of the natural beauty that abounds in our contemporary island environment.

Barry's passion for pottery has led to local and international distinction. In 2003, Barry was a recipient of the Governor's Humanities Award in the CNMI. He was celebrated for bringing local cultural elements of design into the vision of the contemporary artist, which has aided the preservation of a primary indigenous cultural art.

In 2008, Barry was one of 31 sculptors worldwide invited to participate in the International Sculpture Symposium in Changchun, China. His ten-foot-high bronze and stainless steel sculpture has a permanent place in the Changchun World Sculpture Park, which is home to hundreds of sculptures from artists around the world. In 2010 he was again chosen to represent the Northern Mariana Islands at the Symposium. Out of 1,060 submissions from around the world, 29 artists were selected to attend the Symposium. Of those 29 artists, four were chosen to create two works of art each. Barry was one of those four.

Barry's artistic talents have also benefited our island community in some very real and significant ways. For example, he joined with others to transform a underutilized area of our local hospital into a calming therapeutic garden for psychiatric patients. He also served as an advisor to a group that worked to apply for, and receive, funding through NOAA's Prescott Grant Program to engage in a regional study

of marine mammal stranding, which will include the development of an interpretive display of the skeletons of marine mammals recovered from the waters around our islands. In aid of local charitable fundraising efforts, Barry also regularly contributes his work for auction or raffle by social service organizations in the Commonwealth.

Today, as a nation, we face challenges to the arts—for both financial and ideological reasons. I hope that we all consider the nexus between the arts and our civilization, globally and locally, as we debate the issues. And I also hope that you will join me in paying tribute to Barry Wonenberg—who has spent much of his life, to the benefit of the Northern Mariana Islands, practicing what President Kennedy preached.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY R. GORSUCH

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero. Not a hero in our typical sense of the word but in a context of heroism that we have seen replicated across the face of this great Nation. Today, Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Terry R. Gorsuch.

He was a man who embodied the characteristics that we rightly honor in our country. He worked hard, overcame adversity, and in business he innovated. He risked all and, by the grace of God and through perseverance, was rewarded with his successful company, Triad Western Constructors.

The story could stop there, but he believed his greatest accomplishment and blessing in life was his family—married to his loving wife, Rita, for 45 years, raising their two children, Traci and Terry D., and then seeing their children grow to adulthood, marry, and blessed the family with two grandchildren, Gracine and Jaydine.

Terry R. Gorsuch lived the American Dream. He worked hard, played by the rules, loved his family, and always extended a helping hand to others. He could not win his final battle as he succumbed to Lou Gehrig's disease, but his admirable moral fiber held firm even as the final sands of his time slipped from beneath his feet.

We don't often reflect on the heroes who make this country work and help make this country what it is, but today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor an American hero, Terry R. Gorsuch.

□ 1930

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Congressional Black

Caucus is pleased that our Democratic leadership has given us the opportunity to once again come to the floor for the first Democratic hour this evening.

I want to just talk a little bit about some of the people who came and visited me in my office in my district this morning. I had a visit from AARP leadership and some of their advocates and volunteers this morning in my St. Croix office. They came to bring this petition to the office, signed by hundreds of people just on one of my islands. And it says:

"Dear Members of Congress,

"Seniors and future retirees earned their benefits after a lifetime of hard work and paying into the system. Yet some Members of Congress from both parties are considering harmful cuts to Medicare and Social Security"—I know nobody in the Congressional Black Caucus is considering those kinds of cuts—"as a part of a deal to pay the Nation's bills. A deal like that could dramatically increase health care costs for seniors and future retirees, threaten their access to doctors, hospitals and nursing homes, and reduce benefit checks they rely on to pay the bills.

"Instead of cutting the benefits of seniors and future retirees, Congress should be reducing wasteful spending and closing tax loopholes. Instead of shifting more health care costs to seniors, Congress should be working to hold down health care costs for everyone," as the Democrats worked very hard to do last year when we passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

So these undersigned are calling on us to oppose any deal that would make harmful cuts to the Medicare and Social Security benefits Americans have been working on for all these years. And this is just the beginning, Mr. Speaker and colleagues. There will be more of these petitions to come.

Some of the participants that came to my office this morning are: Aloma Peters, Lucie Rodriguez, Elizabeth Torruella, Nicolas Encarnacion, Luz D. Sierra, Theodora Moorehead, Ann Thomas, Ellarine Batiste, Joan Sackey, Miguel Ramos, Ramomta Cagnes, Doris Brown, Paul Simmonds, Denyce Singleton, Genny Dargan, and Lumoz Ayala, but representing the hundreds of people that sent this petition to the Congress of the United States.

In my district, and they talked about this this morning, we have one of the highest utility bills in our country, and they're just trying to figure out what they would do if their Social Security checks were not coming to them next month.

But a default is not just catastrophic for individuals on Social Security. It would be catastrophic for everyone. It's catastrophic for our Nation and our economy. The poor, of course, would lose their safety net and the ability to pull themselves out of poverty, the help that they need.

And the middle class will also pay a price. It would be so catastrophic that

mortgage payments would increase by over \$1,000 for the average family. Credit card interest would increase by \$250 for the average family. Families could pay an additional \$182 per year on utilities. I'm sure our utilities in the Virgin Islands would be much higher than that. And families could pay an additional \$318 per year on food. They could lose thousands of dollars in their retirement savings.

We are so proud and honored to have a leader like Leader NANCY PELOSI, who has represented us in all of the discussions at the White House, and has stood strong for Democratic priorities and kept the voices of House Democrats and the interests of the American people on the table.

We have heard of two different proposals that are coming forth this evening. It's interesting that Speaker BOEHNER has brought forth a proposal with, still, no tax hikes. We were never talking about tax hikes, Mr. Speaker. We were talking about letting the temporary Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans expire, as they were always intended to expire.

His proposal speaks about entitlement reforms and savings. I just read the letter from the AARP, the petition, at least in part, which calls on us to save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Yet the Republican proposal would include entitlement reforms and savings.

And again, here comes the balanced budget amendment, a budget amendment that would be required before the end of the year. And then a short-term lifting of the debt ceiling, something that will not bring the stability to our economy and that would still put our credit in the world at risk.

He says it's a two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable. Is that what this is all about? Or is it that we're trying to restore the good faith and credit of this Nation?

Their two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable, I don't think he needs to be held accountable. He's been a good President, and he doesn't need us to help him be accountable.

They have cuts. They want cuts that exceed the debt hike, the hike in the debt ceiling. I think that's a new one. I thought that originally we talked about having a balance between the lifting of the debt ceiling and the cuts.

Caps to control future spending. Well, we know what that would mean. All the programs that our communities, the communities that we represent, would lose funding for programs that they need. Again, here comes the balanced budget amendment and entitlement reforms and, of course, no tax hikes.

Now, I've been joined by several of my colleagues, and I'd like them to join in this Special Order if they are ready at this point in time. And I'm always pleased to be joined on these Monday evenings by the gentlelady from Houston, Texas, Congresswoman

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and we're glad to yield to her such time as she might consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands. And let me thank you for persisting in discussing these issues with our colleagues. You have been determined, and your leadership has caused us to have this, I think, very thoughtful discussion more often than not.

I'm also pleased to be joined by my friend and colleague from Virginia, who has developed tenure on these issues dealing with the budget and has always been helpful. Mr. SCOTT, on really sort of getting us through the weeds.

And in an hour or two, or approximately an hour and a half maybe, the President will speak to the Nation. And I believe that this President truly appreciates democracy and, frankly, has no problem with coming to the American people in a straightforward and honest manner.

□ 1940

But it really is important I think to educate ourselves, to educate our colleagues, because with all the chatter, it seems as if they've lost their way.

Soon after the President speaks tonight—I believe around 9 o'clock—Mr. BOEHNER will come forward. But if our Republican friends come forward, are they coming forward with facts? Will they educate the American people to inform them that the debt ceiling has been raised 100 times before? Will they educate the American people that probably for the first time in 2011 they have actually put “debt ceiling” in your vocabulary. Now it's going to be highlighted in Webster's dictionary. Most Americans did not know that terminology, but I think those of us who remember our history and those who studied the Constitution—even those of us who are lawyers remember the importance of studying the Constitution, and will always remember the words the “full faith and credit of the United States.” Even in difficult days that keeps the country going. Why? Because the world buys America's Treasury notes. They buy it willingly and openly and excitedly, which means that our dollar is strong and that people are happily holding on to the Treasury note, again, because they believe that America will never default on her debt.

Now if you wanted to get more detailed, I'd refer you to the 14th Amendment, section 4. There's a lot of chatter about what it means, but the clear language says that the public debt shall not be questioned. Of course it lists wars and other issues that occurred in the historical perspective of that amendment, but scholars have not formed opposition to the thought—hardcore opposition—that it also lives today and really means that we must recognize the public debt and pay our bills. So full faith and credit and a constitutional premise for doing what we should do.

So why don't we just move forward so that on August 2, or even before that, we will not have to face our seniors looking for their Social Security check, or maybe even visit a nursing home, as I have done over the last 2 weeks and before, and see seniors who are able to pay their way, but others who are on Medicaid. So I don't think that we should suggest that this is a drama and a dramatization to say that some seniors will be put out on the curb because they depend upon Medicaid. Even those who worked but had jobs that did not allow them to have a 401(k) or long-term care, they depend upon Medicaid.

And as we look at the plan that we will hear tonight, it's been put on the Web site by Speaker BOEHNER, there is a great deal of fear that Social Security—or apprehension might be the word that we want to use—that really the Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security safety net are in the eye of the storm. And so when you look at no tax hikes—which we have heard a number of people raise their voices on that, and I think it should be noted that the Obama administration and this Democratic leadership in the last Congress gave tax cuts over and over again, and particularly gave tax cuts to the working and middle class. The stimulus package, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, gave tax cuts. But how do you truly say to the American people that we're trying to do what you do, which is to tighten your belts, that is, looking realistically at the right kinds of cuts—and most economists will tell you that the cuts should be long range. They tell you it makes no sense to talk about cuts overnight. In fact, it's unrealistic. The family sits at the kitchen table trying to balance their books. It is almost impossible for them, in the next 24 hours, to have a total change. They have to, over a measured period of time—maybe someone gets another job, maybe someone finds an increased amount of wages, and then they, over time, cut their budget and begin to pay bills. America has to pay its bills right now. But over the timeframe, we need to look for ways to raise revenue.

So let me just share with you: A friend of ours, a colleague, Congressman BISHOP has shared this very potent poster that is very easy to understand. We need to allow those tax cuts for a small percentage of the American public—and this is not a class warfare situation. I believe it is important for people to enjoy their wealth, to create wealth, to create jobs, but this is what we call equal sacrifice, accepting the burden of being an American, rising to the cause when you're called upon to serve. No one can compare to the men and women right now as we stand here that are on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. No one can compare to families who are welcoming flag-draped coffins home right now because their soldiers died on the battlefield. We can't compare to that. But right now

America needs all of us, and she needs us to stand up and be counted.

And so there are wealthy persons like Warren Buffett and Bill Gates who for a long period of time indicated that these tax cuts need to expire. Here is the revenue right here. There are 30,000 households that report incomes of more than \$1 million. One day of the Bush tax cuts for millionaires expiring gives us \$120 million. That may provide the resources for our national parks and wildlife. It may as well shore up hospitals that really depend upon Medicare reimbursement. It might help in a military family's pay increase. Then of course if you take one week of allowing those tax cuts to expire, here is revenue to the Federal Government—here you get \$857 million. That is one week. Just a reminder, in terms of moneys that were spent, we created 3 million jobs—and I'll get to that. I think I'm going to hold that point because I want you to see the difference—\$857 million comes in for one week. That's Pell grants for our students; that's allowing research at the NIH for cancer, cures for cancer and as well for heart disease, stroke, neurological disease; payments for those suffering from mental health needs.

And then if you just go 1 month of the expiration of the Bush cuts, you have \$3.43 billion. Now in the Recovery and Reinvestment, the President, because of the crisis he faced—which was none of the Clinton surplus was left; it was all gone because of two unpaid wars—he had to come in and save us. So about \$800 billion in the Recovery Act put 3 million jobs on the table. It created 3 million jobs. Just imagine what would happen if those tax cuts expired. We would have \$3.43 billion, and we would have the opportunity to multiply that, which I think goes in about six times—math on the floor of the House—a little less than that, four times. It would create 4 times 3 million: 12 million jobs—real quick math here.

So the question is, and let me reverse that math because I see BOBBY SCOTT looking up. I thought it was 343; it's only 3. So I won't do any math on the floor of the House, but I will say that it will create jobs. Because we had \$800 billion—I was reading that as \$343 billion. So it was \$3.43, and then if we do 1 year of Bush cuts, it will be \$41 billion. And so we can take a portion of the \$800 billion and we can see the jobs that will be created by \$3 billion and \$41 billion.

What I will say to you, my friends, is that the announcement that is going to be made by the Speaker doesn't give us that flexibility. It truly undermines the safety network of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, but it also puts in some elements that clearly undermine the running of this country.

A balanced budget amendment is not realistic for the United States because the Federal Government takes care of 50 States, not just one. And our friends will tell us that these States have balanced budgets. It's okay when you're

taking care of one household, but if you're taking care of 300 million households plus, when that particular State that needs the Federal Government—like Missouri during the horrible tornadoes, or Alabama, or the floods, or any other manmade or natural disaster—they want us to be able to help them. A balanced budget amendment would not allow that.

□ 1950

And then the caps to control spending do not allow the discretion to be able to make priorities when priorities are necessary.

The last point I want to make about what our Speaker will be announcing tonight to calm the markets is that this is going to be a bifurcated process. Let me say to my colleagues, if you are having fun now, just think about 4 months from now or 6 months. We will have to go through this again. Another debate about the debt ceiling. And I remind you, we have raised it 100 times before. Most Americans have never heard of it because we worked with the Presidents, like President Reagan who in 1983 wrote his own Republican Senate majority leader, Senator Baker, and said you cannot not pass the debt ceiling. It is incalculable to think of America defaulting on her bills.

So here we go with a proposal that would cause us to have to vote twice in a 6-month period. What does that mean? It means that a young couple trying to buy a house sees a surge in their interest rate. It means if you have a credit card, it may be defunct only because you cannot afford to pay the surging interest rate. Fees for you to buy a house might skyrocket. Housing costs might go up. Houses might stop being built.

So I would simply ask my colleagues today: let's be Americans. Let's look at what we can do together. Just allow these tax cuts to expire and allow us to be able to calculate this amount of money. And, again, \$3.43 billion and \$41 billion makes a difference in the lives of Americans.

So I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for allowing me to share some thoughts and to hopefully dispel some myths, and also some fears. It is \$14.3 trillion. It is a big number, but economists will tell you that America is not broke. It's not broken, either. It is at a stage when we need to come together to raise this debt ceiling and go back into regular order.

Whether I agree or disagree with what the House Republicans bring forward in the appropriation process, we can hassle that out on the floor of the House. But we will allow America to pay her bills. And soldiers on the battlefield will not fear that grandparents are not getting their Social Security, or worrying about their family members getting compensation that they are truly due because of the sacrifice that their loved ones are making on behalf this Nation. I believe America is going to stand up and be counted.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you, and I thank you for bringing the charts so we can see very clearly how much money is lost from just not taking the tax cuts back to the Clinton tax rates. You can imagine, and I'm not doing any math on the floor, either, but how much money we have lost during the time those cuts have been in place and will continue to lose through next year.

The Republican proposal that is being brought to us now, I don't see any investment for the future. No investment in education, no investment in relieving ourselves of our dependence on foreign fuel or continuing to invest in health care or creating jobs. There is nothing like that. It is just cut, cut, cut; and the economists also tell us that this is not the time to be cutting spending.

We have a budget guru here with us this evening, the person who leads us every year in putting together a fantastic Congressional Black Caucus budget, one that not only invests in the future and in all of those things that I talked about, but also has every year, has found a way while investing to also reduce the deficit.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. If we are going to talk about how bad the budget situation is now, I think it makes sense to explain how we got here.

First, in the early 1990s, the budget had gone totally out of whack. The first President Bush got together with the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate. Unfortunately, we had to break his pledge on "read my lips, no new taxes," and they came to an agreement and did a little bit to fix the budget.

In 1993 after President Clinton came in, we did some serious work about the budget. We raised some taxes and got the budget under control in the 1993 budget. When you vote on budgets, they are tough budgets. President Bush to a large extent can credit his decision to address the budget with new taxes as part of the reason for his defeat.

And when the Democrats, without a single Republican vote in the House, and not a single Republican vote in the Senate, passed the 1993 budget, 50 Democrats lost their seats. It was a tough vote. You lose your seats when you have very serious deficit reduction. But as a result of that 1993 budget, we not only balanced the budget in just a few short years, but we went into significant surplus and created a record number of jobs. The Dow Jones Industrial Average almost quadrupled.

In 1995, when the Republicans got in control by demagoguing the votes that we cast fixing the budget, they came in and tried to undermine everything in the entire budget. President Clinton let the government get shut down rather than sign those irresponsible budgets that the Republicans passed.

As a result of his tenacity and holding on to his original plan, the budget

was balanced in a few short years. Now, there are some in Congress who talk about the historic balanced budget amendment in the mid-90s. Well, if they hadn't come to such agreement, the balance would have balanced itself. We didn't know when we voted on that, as a matter of fact, whether the budget had already gone into surplus. They hadn't finished counting the money. It went from a 290 deficit, we got down to \$10 billion, and the agreement slowed down the progress a little bit. But we still went into surplus.

In 2001, Chairman Greenspan was answering questions like, what's going to happen when we pay off the entire national debt held by the public? What's going to happen to interest rates? What's going to happen to the bond market when there are no government bonds? How do you calculate investment strategy when you don't have government bonds setting the no-risk limit, and you have increased rate of return after that, how do you calculate investment strategies if there are no government bonds because you have paid them all off?

By 2008, it was projected we would owe no money to China, Japan, and Saudi Arabia. We would have paid off our entire national debt. So people are thinking this is hard. We had done it. In 2001, by August of 2001, after the first round of tax cuts, we had already gone broke. Instead of the surplus, Social Security surplus, they were talking about the lock box, put that away for Social Security, Medicare surplus, put that in the lock box for Medicare. We had a surplus over that.

By August of President Bush's first year, we had gone through all of the surplus, and we were into Social Security and Medicare by August. You cannot blame September 11 for the fact that we had already gone broke a month before. And so after two tax cuts, not paid for, after prescription drug benefit not paid for, a couple of wars not paid for, we are in the ditch.

Now, during the Clinton administration, we had PAYGO. You wanted to spend some more money, you had to come up with the money to pay for it. You wanted to cut taxes, you had to cut some programs, you had to pay for it. Everything you did, you had to pay for it. When President Bush came in, they did away with PAYGO and put us in the ditch.

Now we're so far in the ditch that most experts suggest we need \$4 trillion in deficit reduction to get back to a point where we are fiscally responsible. About \$4 trillion. The Simpson-Bowles committee came up with one plan with a lot of this and a little of that—\$4 trillion. But there is one interesting thing that you could do to come up with almost \$4 trillion: let all of the Bush tax cuts expire. Done. That is all you have to do.

As a matter of fact, in the Congressional Black Caucus budget this year, we started off with that premise. Let them all expire. But we wanted to extend some, and so we paid for them. We

cut the oil loopholes and extended some, and we cut some other loopholes, and added this tax and cut this. We got to a point where we could extend a lot of the tax cuts because we paid for them.

□ 2000

If you want to know what deficit reduction looks like without revenue, you can look at the continuing resolution earlier this year. It started out at \$66 billion, which annualized, was about a hundred billion. And 10 years, that would be about a trillion. If you look at what was in that first trillion dollars that they wanted to cut, it was so bad that they couldn't get it passed. They ended up having to compromise. We had cuts in the safety net like community health centers, cuts in energy assistance for low-income seniors, cuts in community action agencies, and we had cuts in investments in the future. Head Start, Pell Grants got cut. Scientific research and NASA all got cut.

And then just perfunctory parts of government. FBI agents got cut. We're sitting up in the Judiciary Committee trying to figure out how to deal with many of the problems we've got, and half of it is we don't need new criminal laws. We need new FBI agents to investigate the cases. FBI agents were cut; 4,000 fewer. Clean Water Grants, Environmental Protection, all cut. Air traffic controllers. There are so few. They're working so hard that they're falling asleep on the job. They were cut.

The next round of cuts would be, obviously, Medicare and housing and other programs were next on the chopping block. We could not get—they could not get that passed. As a matter of fact, by the time they finished, now they're going to a program suggesting that we need to cut not \$1 trillion but \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion. If you couldn't get the first trillion passed because you're so deep into the things that people believe in, things that—Clean Water Grants, food inspectors. There are so few food inspectors in that budget that some meatpacking plants would have to close because they are obligated to have a Federal meat inspector on site. And if you can't be on site, you can't operate. They had so few meat inspectors that they anticipated many of the companies would have to close down or at least close temporarily because there were so few.

Now they're trying to figure out how you can do \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion worth of cuts. They came up with this idea of the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is something that recognizes the fact that we've already spent the money. So you raise the debt ceiling not because you're spending any money but because you have already spent the money. It's a perfunctory kind of thing. Dozens of times, almost once a year over the last 50 years, we've had to increase the debt ceiling. Democrats and Republicans all have had to vote for the debt ceiling.

The charade about the thing is usually the majority party has to cast the tough votes and the minority party gets to talk about fiscal irresponsibility and grandstand a little bit, but it's never in the context that there's any question about whether the debt ceiling is going to be increased. Speeches are made, but it's in the context it's going to pass. And you can make a speech about it.

Now they're saying, Maybe we won't increase the debt ceiling. Nobody knows what would happen if the debt ceiling were not increased, if we defaulted on our bonds, if we didn't send out Social Security checks. Nobody knows what would happen—what would happen to the investments, what would happen to the interest rates. We had a temporary technical glitch a few years ago where checks were a day or two—couple of days late going out and they calculate that as a result of that little glitch we paid about half a percent higher interest rate for many years.

Now, a 1 percent interest rate on the national debt now is about in the range of \$100 billion. So if you're looking at what would happen if you defaulted on the debt and people charged more interest, well, that's the order of magnitude that we would be talking about. We shouldn't have to even discuss what would happen "if," because it could be anything. And who would want to find out? We ought to just go ahead and increase the debt ceiling and not use it as a threat that unless you do this, we'll blow up the economy. I would hope that our leadership would not capitulate to those kind of threats because if you capitulate this time, in October they can shut down October by not passing appropriations bills. Don't get "my way or the highway" to close down the government. In a year or so you would have to do the debt ceiling again. Same thing.

So if you capitulate to these kinds of childish threats, there will be no end to it and you will certainly invite them back. As a matter of fact, what is going on now is they're kind of slow-walking us through some cuts that never could have been made in the normal legislative process. Last year, in December, we extended the Bush tax cuts. That cost \$400 billion a year. Now we're broke, and we need to come up with about \$400 billion a year, as if we had forgotten what we did last December.

Now, when we extended those tax cuts, there's no mention of how it would be paid for. It would have been nice to know what the plan was, whether we're going to have to cut Social Security or Medicare in order to afford the tax cuts that were extended in December. Now they're going to try to get some cuts that they couldn't otherwise get if you're making rational choices. And legislative process is about choices. If you want a program, you ought to pay for it. If you're willing to pay the taxes, then you can have your program. Not willing to pay the taxes, can't have your program.

Last year we passed health care reform. It cost a trillion dollars. We raised more than a trillion dollars in taxes. That's a balanced approach. If we didn't want to pay the taxes, we couldn't have the program. And so that's the balanced approach that we're not making as we go along now because the next step in this process will be not cuts but caps.

No program will be cut if any deal comes on. These \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion deals come back. Not a single program will be cut. There will just be caps. Three months from now, when you try to appropriate under those caps, you'll wonder why you can't afford Head Start, why you can't afford any food inspectors, why you can't afford any FBI agents, because the caps are so low.

If you put them all together, if you had made your choices, if you had known you were going to have to cut Head Start and FBI agents and Clean Water Grants when you cut taxes, maybe you wouldn't have cut the taxes. You should have made the choices all at once.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I think you said playing politics. Is that the same as a schoolyard game of playing chicken? And in the course of what you just said, is there any light for creating jobs in this approach that is being taken, where you have no revenue and you have cuts, with no plan? I see no opportunity for creating jobs.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. In terms of jobs, much has been said about the reason why you would not want to increase taxes in an economic downturn. Because you would adversely affect the economy. That's true. But if you have spending cuts, the effect on the economy is not only larger but more direct and more immediate. Increases in taxes don't hit until the following year. As soon as you cut spending, somebody is getting fired. Jobs get lost immediately when you have spending cuts.

So for the same reason that they say you can't increase taxes during an economic downturn, the stronger argument could be made that you should not have any spending cuts. The estimates on some of the Republican plans are that hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost if those plans had been enacted.

Now, one of the real tragedies about all this discussion is sometimes—talk about rhetoric in politics—some people are talking about this so-called balanced budget amendment as a condition of moving forward. Well, one of the things about the legislation that we'll consider called the balanced budget amendment is a bill that has a misleading title. It says: Proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Guess what that legislation does not require?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Does it require a balanced budget?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. It does not require a balanced budget. What it does is require a three-fifths vote to pass a budget that is not unbalanced. Every budget we consider this year was not in balance the first year. So the Ryan budget that passed would have required a three-fifths vote. The Republican Study Committee plan that was not balanced the first year that in the fullness of time would cut discretionary spending 50, 60, or 70 percent was not in balance the first year. It would require a three-fifths vote.

Now, as I said, when you cast those tough votes, the first President Bush lost his Presidency trying to balance the budget. Fifty Democrats lost their seats in 1993 trying to balance the budget.

□ 2010

I will guarantee you that there will be Republicans who will lose their seats for voting for the Ryan plan because it included, essentially, a repeal of Medicare and replacing it with an inadequate voucher, and they're going to lose their seats over it. We already picked up one seat in upstate New York where that Ryan plan was an issue, but when you vote on real deficit reduction, people will lose their seats.

If you were to move the threshold up to three-fifths and if you were the chief sponsor of a severe deficit reduction plan, common sense will let you know that it will be harder to pass if you move that thing up to three-fifths. So the enactment will make it harder to pass deficit reduction. Once you need three-fifths, there is no limit to how irresponsible you can get. The tax cut extensions of \$400 billion in December, that got three-fifths. You could have more tax cuts and more additional spending totally out of control, and all you'd need is three-fifths.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. But the caps would be in place.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The caps are another part.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. They would be in place as part of the bill, but you couldn't raise any revenue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. There are four provisions.

The first is you need three-fifths to pass a budget. That's going to make it harder to pass a budget. The second provision is a two-thirds vote to raise taxes. So, if you're trying to balance a budget, having a two-thirds vote to raise taxes will obviously make it harder to balance the budget. This thing is called a "balanced budget amendment." The first two provisions obviously make it harder to balance the budget.

The third provision is you need a two-thirds vote to pass a budget that spends more than 18 percent of the

gross national product, a two-thirds vote to pass if it's more than 18 percent of GDP. We haven't been that low since we passed Medicare, so that's going to put a lot of pressure on the Medicare program. Guess what? If you put all these things together with the pressure on Medicare, we know we can cut the benefits with a simple majority, but to save the program with new taxes: two-thirds in the House and two-thirds in the Senate.

There is another little insulting provision at the end. It's a three-fifths vote to raise the debt ceiling, and raising the debt ceiling this year has been enough of a spectacle that they want it to be an annual, everyday occurrence.

You have this thing called the "balanced budget amendment," which will make it harder to balance the budget, and it would certainly put pressure on Social Security and Medicare by allowing those programs to be cut with a simple majority. Yet to save them with new revenues like increasing the amount right now with Social Security a little over \$100,000—no more Social Security tax—and if we were to extend that like Medicare to all of your income, we could pretty much solve the problem, but you couldn't do that without a two-thirds vote. You couldn't close an oil loophole to save Social Security without a two-thirds vote—but to cut the benefits, a simple majority. They want to inflict the balanced budget amendment in there to preserve their oil company millionaire loopholes and jeopardize Social Security and Medicare and put us in a budget situation where it will be virtually impossible to ever balance the budget.

People should read the bill past the title. Most people, when they hear the title, they start debating whether it's a good idea or a bad idea to have a balanced budget or whether it's a good idea or a bad idea to balance the budget every year without exception, which would not allow countercyclical spending in times of downturn.

Now, interestingly enough, the gentlelady from Texas and I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and we heard one of the Representatives from Arizona talk about the Arizona balanced budget amendment and how that works on the State level. Then we did a little research to find out: How did Arizona balance its budget?

We found out, first of all, they got billions of dollars of stimulus money to help them balance the budget, but that wasn't enough. Do you know, in the last couple of years, the Arizona State government has sold—sold—their State capitol and sold their Supreme Court building and leased it back? They got hundreds of millions of dollars in the kitty that helped them balance the budget by selling the State capitol and by selling the Supreme Court. That's what a balanced budget amendment does for you, I guess.

We need to make sure that we don't get lost in the rhetoric about the misleading titles of legislation, and we

need to actually read past the title in the balanced budget amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. That happened so often with some of these bills.

I thank you for taking us through the history of how we got to where we are, because there is a lot of rhetoric that tries to hide how we got here: the fact that hard votes were taken in '93, that President Clinton did leave a large surplus and that, by the end of President Bush's term, we were in a deep deficit and then in a recession—a recession that was not created by this President but inherited by this President. When they talk about, yes, President Obama has increased the deficit, what should he do—allow us to fall deeper into a recession?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. What would he do? What would the Republicans have supported him doing to reduce the deficit? Would they have supported increased taxes? What spending are they talking about with specificity?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. They have never accepted increased taxes, not in any crisis.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Legislation is about choices. I mean, if you want a Head Start program, you've got to pay for it. If you want clean water grants, you've got to pay for them. We need to be making these choices, not in the context of threats about blowing up the economy, but by making the rational choices about what kind of vision and what kind of future we think we want. Some of us think that education is important. You have to pay taxes to get a good education. Some people think that clean water grants are important. Some people think that scientific research, food inspectors, FBI agents, air traffic controllers are important. There are a lot of things we like in government, and you've got to pay for them.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you again for joining us and for laying out that history.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. To add to what my colleague just said, we are also in a climate of fighting against terrorism, and in order to secure the homeland, you have to make choices about how you invest, so I have a different opinion. I think, if you invest money, you get innovation and you get jobs; and none of what has been said by Speaker BOEHNER says anything about innovation, jobs, and he has no, seemingly, understanding of the importance of securing the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by Members of the Congressional Black Caucus to call upon Congress to pass a bill that increases the debt ceiling so that we can avoid economic disaster and continue to work for the American people in repairing our economy and creating jobs.

While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support any measure that unduly constrains the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at \$14.3 trillion. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be avoided until August 2nd.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For foreign nations and investors, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the federal government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, some of my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts.

While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the

debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present. Raising the debt limit simply matches the amount the United States is allowed to borrow to the amount it already owes.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraordinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3rd, the stock market will react violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question. Credit rating agencies like Moody's and Standard & Poors stand ready to downgrade the triple A rating that America currently enjoys.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay them back. Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors.

Furthermore, any investors who continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. With uncertainty still lingering in the markets and in the minds of citizens, we must not allow another wild fluctuation in the markets to occur due to default.

One of the major reasons that the job market continues to remain so stagnant is the fact that the flow of credit to small businesses that enables them to hire and expand has slowed.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda. They knew that the "Cut, Cap, and Balance Act" was not a realistic proposal and that it was not going to pass the Senate. They just wanted to waste time.

Mr. Speaker, along with the Congressional Black Caucus, I believe that Congress should increase the debt ceiling to meet the obligations the United States has already promised to undertake. By refusing to do so, it endangers our economy and the recovery of our jobs.

Last week Republicans introduced the "Cut, Cap and Balance Act" which I aptly named the "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill." Because it tap danced around raising our debt ceiling and acting in a responsible manner to pay our nation's debt obligations. That bill would have forced our nation to join a losers club as it would have eliminated important social programs such as Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and Pell grants. The theme for the Republicans seems to be a focus on cutting programs for the most at need and ignoring the need to focus on Job creation. This bill busts the hopes and dreams of our children, seniors, and military families. It busts the hopes to grow our nation in the future. The "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill" was just a distraction and now we have the opportunity to once again get serious about raising our debt. We can not continue to waste a tremendous amount of time. The Deadline is right around the corner. The American people cannot have a government that is the embodiment of living check to check. We must do something NOW!

For a moment think about the American people. Step back and envision the faces of those who will be impacted if we are not successful in finding common ground. They are the faces of the the elderly who will not receive their social security payments. They are the faces of children and infants who will not receive their WIC benefits. They are the faces of hardworking every day Americans, including the multitudes of poor working families who will not be able to receive the benefits they need from government run programs that are keeping them from falling into homelessness. When you think of our future, also see our present. Without raising this debt limit we are putting the present and the future of Americans at risk.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for adding that again.

At this time, I would like to yield to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from Oakland, who is also chair of the Out of Poverty Caucus. A lot of times—well, even up to this weekend—nobody is talking about the poor.

I thank you for starting the Out of Poverty Caucus and for leading us through an agenda that continues even today of pathways out of poverty and for bringing us to the floor every day for the last couple of weeks to talk about how the Republican policies, the bills that they are proposing and the way they're holding the debt ceiling hostage are hurting the poor in our country.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for leading this Special Order tonight.

I also thank you for your leadership on behalf of, really, my constituents and on behalf of the entire country because it is so important that you as first vice chair of the Congressional

Black Caucus—and chairman CLEAVER, who chairs the Congressional Black Caucus—continue to be the conscience of the Congress and to speak out and sound the alarm about the consequences of possible bad political and policy decisions. So thank you very much for what you're doing. It's so important that these issues be swept from under the rug and discussed in an open forum.

The debate and the discussion with Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE were very important to have because I think that the public, who is listening to this discussion, will understand the history and the background and the technical aspects about this budget and deficit reduction plan that the Speaker is bringing forward, which really do, once again, put the American people as pawns, I think, in a game that they are not responsible for playing. People cannot wait any longer. They are tired of having their futures threatened by Republican politicians who are playing games that put the entire Nation and our economy at risk.

As for the Ryan budget and now this debt ceiling plan put forth by the Republicans, I'll tell you that what comes to mind is, when you look at it and when you listen to what's in it, it's a "you're on your own" kind of plan. For those who are wealthy and those are beholden to special interests and hedge fund billionaires and millionaires and all of those who have benefitted from the tax cuts, they'll be fine; but for those, as you mentioned earlier, who are poor or who could possibly fall from middle income into the ranks of the poor, this debt ceiling plan put forth by the Republicans is morally wrong and is fiscally unsound. We don't want to see the majority of the American people on their own once again, so I'm glad we're here tonight discussing this.

A Republican default on our debt, this would devastate the retirement savings of millions of American seniors—just devastate. We know that Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—these government safety net programs—have provided for millions of our seniors to live a decent life in their golden years and to not fall into the ranks of poverty. Now all of these programs are on the chopping block. It makes no sense. A Republican default on our debts, it would weaken our entire economy and weaken our national security, and we heard earlier that hundreds of thousands of jobs could be lost, that even more jobs would be lost. We should be about creating jobs, not putting forth measures that would take us further down the road into a recession and, for some, a depression.

□ 2020

In fact, it's very simple. America must pay our bills on time, and we must do this in a way that does not devastate the safety net for our senior citizens and our children's future.

Either you are on the side of the American people and want to safeguard vital human needs programs like Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, critical food benefits for families and children—or you're on the side of the billionaires and the bankers, financial services industries, subsidies for massive oil company profits. You're on one side or the other in this debate.

The Congressional Black Caucus continues to be on the side of our Nation's most vulnerable populations, who, in these very hard economic times, depend on these vital safety net programs for their survival day-in and day-out. Meanwhile, we keep hearing claims from the other side of the aisle that only misdirect attention.

America really is not broke. We're the richest and we're the strongest country in the world, and we still have the best ideas, the best workers, the best schools, and the largest economy in the world. But we won't be for long if the Republicans have their way.

You know, you often wonder for those who say that default will not wreak havoc on the country. There are some who I think could care less if we went into default because if you listen to what they're saying, it doesn't really bother a lot of Members here. And that, to me, is tragic.

Some tell us that the future is bleak and that the government cannot afford to invest in a prosperous and growing America. But the truth is that raising the debt ceiling should be very simple. It should be a simple vote by all of us to allow the United States Treasury to fund all of its programs and obligations and debts of the entire Federal Government that are already in the law.

Republicans in the House have already voted to support and pass a \$9 trillion increase in the national debt. And now again, instead of working to create jobs and help our Nation rise out of this great recession, and depression for many, the Republicans are really playing a high-stakes game of chicken with the safety net and with the security of every single American so that they can protect the massive—and Congressman SCOTT and yourself talked about this—\$400 billion tax cut that Congressman SCOTT warned us we would have to pay for some time soon. It came sooner rather than later, Congressman SCOTT. And we listened to you, and those of us who voted "no," we tried. But here we are with your prediction coming true.

Here we're asking once again those who have been hurt, the most vulnerable, to pay once again. And that is just downright wrong.

A failure to raise the debt limit would mean an immediate stop to over 40 percent of the entire Federal Government. Our soldiers would not get paid, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid payments would be delayed. And the health and safety of every single American would be threatened, along with the health of our very fragile economy.

The incredibly irresponsible position that the Republicans have taken protecting tax breaks for the super rich, Wall Street corporations, Big Oil, that seems to be more important than preventing the United States government from defaulting on our debts.

And let me just remind those who want to cut Medicare and dismantle Medicare. That's basically what they want to do. Medicare recipients did not create the national debt. And that is unconscionable to even talk about balancing the budget or paying down the debt on the backs of our most vulnerable populations, including those who are facing living in poverty.

And let me remind our Republican colleagues again that the Congressional Black Caucus, under the leadership of Chairman CLEAVER, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, already offered a budget—and he mentioned it earlier—that would have saved \$5.7 trillion from the deficit, protected our most vulnerable communities, and would have ensured the stability of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And our budget was balanced.

So the country is not broke. We know how we got here—two wars, these massive tax cuts for the very wealthy, Wall Street going amok. So it's time to be real, and it's time to be truthful. It's time to be honest, and it's time to make sure that the decisions we make here will not dig us deeper into the hole. America really doesn't have any more time for these Republican games.

Let me also conclude by talking about those who are unemployed because if we don't do something quickly, the ranks of the unemployed are going to grow even greater. And unemployment compensation is really survival funds, survival compensation, until we figure out how we're going to create jobs. And incidentally, the Republicans haven't put forth any job plan since they've been in power.

But these long-term unemployed Americans who have run out of their unemployment compensation, known as the 99ers, they continue to face uncertainty and hardships, and the House must act now to stand with these individuals.

H.R. 589, which my colleague, Congressman SCOTT, and I introduced earlier this year, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN and many members of the Congressional Black Caucus are co-sponsors. This would add 14 weeks of unemployment emergency compensation. It would make these benefits retroactively available to people who have exhausted all of their benefits and are still unemployed. Extending these benefits for long-term unemployed individuals will stimulate our economy, empower more consumers, and create more jobs.

So this extension should be in any deficit reduction plan because we know that not only is it the right thing to do, the morally correct thing to do, this is the economically prudent thing

to do in terms of passing an emergency extension. It really should be the first step in taking bold steps to create millions of jobs for Americans.

So we should be working to pass a jobs bill that would help people find this pathway out of poverty. We should help keep middle-income individuals from falling into poverty. We should be looking at a budget and a plan that, yes, will help pay down our debt. Yes, it is part of deficit reduction—that incorporates deficit reduction as part of it. But no, that does not cut Medicare, Social Security, or Medicaid. And we should really be trying to figure out a way to create some jobs for people. I mean, that's the bottom line. That's what we need to do.

Thank you again, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, for calling this Special Order today. We should make sure that the world knows that the Congressional Black Caucus continues to call attention to the games that Republicans are playing that will threaten our national security interests as well as our economic interests. And the fact that we're here working to try to create some jobs and to help ensure that this debt ceiling is raised, that's the bottom line.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I just want to mention that when we had our job summit about a week and a half ago, we passed out some information to those in attendance that added up about 30 job-creating pieces of legislation that just the CBC has introduced in this year. I don't believe that the Republican majority has brought any job-creating bills to the floor, and in this recovery, that's what we need, jobs.

I know sometimes we were accused of class warfare, but we're not pitting the poor against the rich or the middle class against the rich. We just think that everyone needs to be on the side of our country. We are calling for shared sacrifice and for fairness.

And really, this ought to be a clean raising of the debt ceiling. The cuts we're talking about that are going to hurt the people of this country are too important for us to be rushing through and using to hold the debt ceiling hostage.

□ 2030

So let's not hold such a critical thing as our ability to pay our bills and take care of our seniors, our children, our people with disabilities, and preserving our creditworthiness not only for Americans but the whole world depends on us, and we cannot let them down. We cannot let the American public down, including my constituents. We cannot let our country down and all of the countries in the world who depend on us.

With that, I thank my colleagues for joining me. I want to, once again, thank the AARP for their petitions and for their strong advocacy on behalf of not only seniors but all Americans and our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Unittell States has reached the current debt ceiling, which is set by law at \$14.294 trillion, and Congress must act by August 2, 2011 to avoid defaulting on its loans. If Congress fails to reach an agreement on raising the debt ceiling, it will cripple our economy, halt our recovery and end up costing taxpayers more in the long-run. For those reasons, I agree with financial analysts and experts who say that raising the debt ceiling is necessary to ensure our fiscal stability and continued economic recovery.

Although the bill to raise the debt limit did not pass in the U.S. House of Representatives in May, I voted in favor of the measure because the consequences would have been disastrous for our economy.

The Republican leadership brought this bill to the floor, but ironically urged their Members not to vote for it. The national debt limit is not a joke and needs to be taken very seriously. Normally, the periodic raising of the national debt limit is a noncontroversial legal necessity to ensure that the U.S. does not default on its debt obligations to foreign creditors and maintains its credit rating.

Raising the debt limit does not authorize new spending—it simply allows the government to finance existing legal obligations that Congresses and presidents of both parties have made in the past. The United States Congress has acted 78 times to raise, extend, or revise the debt limit; 49 times under Republican presidents and 29 times under Democratic presidents.

While no one is more frustrated than I am about our current fiscal state of affairs, I support responsible efforts to bring down our national debt. I firmly believe that it is a mistake to compound past irresponsibility with further irresponsibility on this issue. If Congress fails to increase the debt limit, the government would start to default on its foreign owned debts, which would have "calamitous" consequences for the U. S. economy. Not to mention it would be unprecedented in American history.

In addition, if the United States defaulted:

Investors would be less likely to lend to this country; borrowing costs, not only for the federal government, but for families, businesses and local governments would increase; and so would interest rates for municipal bonds, mortgages, car loans, and student and business loans.

Mr. Speaker, America's debt is a non-partisan concern. Both parties share responsibility for ensuring that this nation's bills are paid. I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues to meet our obligations and put forward a productive plan to reduce the deficit.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my leadership, the majority leader on the Republican side, the Speaker of the House, and our conference chairman, Representative JEB HENSARLING, for giving us the oppor-

tunity—us, the House GOP Doctors Caucus—to have the Special Order hour this evening.

It's kind of convenient, Mr. Speaker; my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the well-respected Members, my friends from the Congressional Black Caucus, were talking about the budget and what we're trying to do with regard to moving forward, talking, of course, about safety net programs and entitlement programs, such as Social Security and Medicare. And that's a great segue into the topic of our discussion this evening because it's going to be about the Medicare program.

We, on our side of the aisle in the Republican-passed House budget, take a responsible approach to solving the Medicare crisis, which the trustees have said to all Members of Congress—not Republicans, not Democrats, not House Members, not Senate Members, but all of us—that according to the trustee report, by the year 2024, if we don't do something about the Medicare program as it currently exists, as it's currently funded, the amount of spending that occurs year after year—and will only increase as more and more of our baby boomers are reaching age 65—if we don't do something about that, then that Medicare part A hospital trust fund is not supported by any constituent premiums, it's going to go broke. It absolutely is going to go broke.

So I say to my Democratic colleagues who just spoke, the compassionate thing—and I know they have great compassion for those who, maybe through no fault of their own, can't help themselves; but the compassionate thing, Mr. Speaker, is to save the program, to guarantee, preserve it for current Medicare recipients. Indeed, even for folks that are only 55 years old today, Medicare, as we know it, would be protected, would be strengthened for all of those individuals. And by the time those who are 55 years old today become 65, in 10 years, around 2024, there would be something like 65 million seniors and a smaller number of disabled individuals in the Medicare program as we know it. They would be in that Medicare program as we know it for the rest of their natural lives. And thank God, because of good health care in this country, women, I think, are living on average to age 82 and men maybe to age 78. So these 65 million people will be on Medicare for a long time. Medicare as we know it.

My colleagues didn't mention this in their hour; but what we do in our budget is go forward with a plan for younger folks—indeed, even for my grandchildren, my 10 grandchildren, the oldest two are 13-year-old twins—but let's say them, or 25-year-olds, 35-year-olds, 45-year-olds, indeed, we create the adult approach, the mature approach to solving the Medicare problem so that it will be there for them instead of nothing come 2024. And maybe some of us have paid for 25 years that FICA tax that's taken out of our paychecks every week or every month.

So I say to my friends, this idea that President Obama has and the leadership of your party of just simply kicking the can down the road doesn't get the job done. It's what we call sometimes—and I know all of us know the expression “whistling past the graveyard,” in other words, pretending that a problem doesn't exist. And that's an unconscionable approach.

I am very pleased tonight, Mr. Speaker, to have a number of my colleagues who have joined with us. Some of them are a part of the House GOP Doctors Caucus. We are mostly medical doctors. There are a number of registered nurses in our caucus. We have a lot of health care providers. There are dentists. But in the aggregate, the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus are medical professionals who spent a lot of their lives practicing medicine and providing care, indeed, under Medicaid and the Medicare programs, seeing those patients mostly at a financial loss, but still very willing to try to help those folks who need us to be there for them in these safety net programs.

I think in the aggregate, the membership of the House GOP Doctors Caucus may have over 350 years of clinical experience. Some of us are getting a little long in the tooth and a little gray by the sideburns. But we are now Members of Congress, and we are trying to do things for our constituents and the seniors of this great country of ours to make sure that we preserve and protect programs like Medicare and Medicaid. And that's what this is all about tonight.

I want to first yield to my friend from Tennessee, my co-OB/GYN doctor. Dr. PHIL ROE has been a Member of this body now for 4 years and has been a great asset. And I know that Dr. ROE has a bill that he wants to address concerning some problems that were enacted under ObamaCare.

I would gladly yield to Dr. ROE from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It's a pleasure to be here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to when Medicare first began. In 1965, there was a problem identified in America where we had a group of our citizens, as they became 65 years of age and older, that didn't have access to quality health care. So a plan was put in place, along with Medicaid for our poor citizens at that point, to access quality care.

In 1965, the Medicare program was a \$3 billion program. There was no Congressional Budget Office at that time. The estimates were in 25 years that this would be a \$15 billion program. It actually turned out to be over a \$100 billion program in 1990. In 2010, it will be somewhere about \$550 billion.

We also have, as has been pointed out in our previous hour by our friends from the Congressional Black Caucus, that we have a tremendous deficit. We're borrowing 42, 43 cents of every dollar that we spend in this country.

So that's why the discussion was started.

I came to Washington—really, I practiced medicine, as Dr. GINGREY said, for over 30 years and realized that we had a serious problem not just in Medicare but in health care. So we came to work on health care reform. In the Physicians Caucus in the previous Congress, there were nine of us in the caucus. Not one of us was consulted on the Affordable Health Care Act. I mean, decades worth of experience, over 200 years of experience in the Congress at that time, and no one—not one of us—was actually consulted.

□ 2040

The way I looked at the problem in our health care system was we had three problems:

One is we had a problem where the system was too expensive. When you go to the doctor, it cost too much money to go see a physician. Number two, we had a group of people out there who didn't have affordable health care coverage. Maybe the husband is a carpenter, as in our area, maybe the wife worked at a local diner or somewhere else that didn't provide insurance coverage. Thirdly, we had a liability problem in this country.

So what did we do? We had an over 2,000-page bill that got through the House and got to the Senate and failed. The Senate dusted a bill off that was 2,500-plus pages, that never went through a committee hearing, that nobody on the House had a chance to do, and I know that the three physicians that are here tonight all read that bill. When I read that bill, Mr. Speaker, I found some things in there, as did my colleagues, which greatly worried us.

How do they fund this bill? Only Washington could fund anything like this. Dr. GINGREY has pointed out that we're trying to save Medicare. Medicare is a system that the Congressional Budget Office says by 2020 will be out of money; 2024, by the actuaries at CMS say will be broke.

There are four parts of Medicare:

Medicare part A, which is paid for by your premiums. That's your hospitalization.

Medicare part B, that's doctor services and some lab services. That's only funded 25 percent from your premiums. The other 75 percent comes from the general fund, the taxpayers.

Medicare Advantage, which was cut drastically by the Affordable Care Act.

And Medicare part D, which is a prescription drug plan, also is only funded 25 percent by our premiums. I'm a Medicare recipient myself, as of last year.

So what did the administration do and the Senate do to fund this Affordable Health Care Act? They took out of an already underfunded program, as I just pointed out, \$500 billion, and Dr. GINGREY just pointed out moments ago that we're adding about 3 million baby boomers per year, so 10,000 per day or more. We're adding millions of new re-

cipients while pulling out of that over \$500 billion, and we call this “saving Medicare.”

We're not talking about tonight, on our hour, the budget impasse. We're talking about what's already been passed. And one of the things I found in there, Mr. Speaker, was a very little known board called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Before, Medicare has had this board in there, which was strictly that, MedPAC. It was an advisory board to Congress, to say, hey, we've got some problems here with funding; maybe we should look over here. Congress would then have the ability to make those decisions.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this poster, because this is exactly what Dr. ROE, Mr. Speaker, is talking about now, this IPAB, Independent Payment Advisory Board. I want all my colleagues to see this poster because this is what Dr. ROE is taking us through at this point.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, what I did when I read this, I looked at it and thought, how was this created and why was it created?

This board has 15 members that are appointed by the administration, by the President, and, quite frankly, I don't want a Republican President or a Democratic President doing this. These people are then approved by the Senate for a 6-year term. They're paid about \$165,000 a year.

And what is their charge? Well, their charge is, is if Medicare spending hits certain targeted limits, that cuts occur first to providers and for prescription drugs and then later to hospitals. What worries me about this is right now we have a problem—and Dr. PAUL BROWN is here tonight, who's a primary care physician—with our patients with their Medicare, finding a physician to take care of them.

What happens is if you hit these targeted limits and physician payments are cut, access to care is going to be cut, quality of care is going to be cut, and, thirdly, the cost to our seniors is going to go up. What also worries me is that this board very much mimics the board that's in England called NICE, the National Institute of Clinical Excellence. This board makes recommendations to their health board there about what care is provided to patients. President Obama has taken this board, he's going to use this, and he actually wants to increase the power of it to help hold Medicare costs down. Ultimately what will happen, when you have more demand for services than you have money to pay for it, is your care will be rationed. That's the fear that we have.

Our concern is, and I've gone to seniors in my district and been very clear and pointed this out at town hall meetings and have held town hall meetings with seniors and said, We want to provide you quality access of care. That's what I do as a doctor. I want to be able to see those patients and have them

help us solve this problem. I think that's the issue that we have, Mr. Speaker, is how do we provide the care for the money we have and provide quality of care and access for our patients? I am extremely concerned that the IPAB will do just the opposite of that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his presentation on the IPAB, that board which Dr. ROE describes, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. Again, I'm going to refer back to a previous poster that I wanted to present as Dr. ROE got into talking about the Democrats' solution to so-called "save Medicare."

They wanted initially to ignore the problem, the fact that Medicare is going broke. As I pointed out in my opening remarks, Medicare today will be broke in less than 10 years. Without action, the Social Security trustees report that Medicare seniors will either see a 22 percent benefit cut or workers will see a 22 percent hike in payroll taxes. So basically, not really completely ignoring the problem, but what the Democrats want to do is create this so-called IPAB board, which Dr. ROE describes. They say there will be no rationing, yet they're restricted in the recommendations that they can make in regard to cuts, and those cuts will be to providers; they will be to pharmaceutical companies that provide the drugs that so greatly keep people alive today that in the past were ending up in the emergency room with strokes because of uncontrolled high blood pressure, needing amputations because of uncontrolled diabetes or needing to be on a dialysis machine because of uncontrolled renal disease. All of these have been helped by Medicare part D. So, clearly, the plan that the Obama administration and our Democratic colleagues have is not for saving Medicare.

At this time, let me yield the floor to my colleague from Georgia, fellow physician and member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, Dr. PAUL BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. I appreciate you yielding a few minutes.

I wanted to kind of break all this down so that the American people could understand very clearly what we're talking about tonight. I've got a little poster here that shows President Obama's and the Democrats' Medicare solution.

This is their Medicare plan. They deny the problem. They deny the problem that the gentleman from Georgia was just talking about with this huge, huge problem, where Medicare is going to go broke in a matter of just a decade. They want to delay any fixes. In fact, Medicare as we know it today exists no longer. ObamaCare took care of that. And they want to destroy it. They will destroy it by letting it go broke.

So this is the Democrat Party's health care plan: Deny It, Delay It, and Destroy It by letting it go broke.

Just recently, one of the government accounting groups released something that should scare every senior, every taxpayer, and every American.

□ 2050

They said that Medicare, within the next couple of decades—that's a lot of zeroes in this; 63 and a lot of zeros. This is the unfunded liability of Medicare over just the next several decades.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, that would be \$63 trillion, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, I just tried to make it so that the zeroes didn't confuse folks. The unfunded liability for Medicare is \$63 trillion. This is unsustainable. There's no way to take care of this.

We need to shore up Medicare. We need to make sure that it's strengthened so that our future generations, not only the senior citizens today, can continue to get Medicare, but the future generations also.

Now, what does \$63 trillion of unfunded liabilities mean to everybody in this country? I mean, that's too big a number for everybody to really consider. So I broke it down to every family in the United States. Every family's part of this \$63 trillion of unfunded liabilities for Medicare, as it exists today, is over \$500,000 per family. \$500,000 per family of unfunded liabilities for Medicare just in the next several decades.

Now, I don't know about most families, but my family can't afford to pay \$500,000 and neither can the government.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I've got a poster that points out just exactly what the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROWN, is saying.

If you look, colleagues, at the bottom of this poster, CBO estimates individual and corporate income tax rates would have to rise by 90 percent through the year 2050 to finance Medicare and Medicaid. And if Medicare is not fixed, millions of workers today will lose the money that they have invested. And, indeed, they have invested with that payroll tax over those many years of their employment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. What the American people need to understand is that we need to strengthen Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

This picture right here is a picture of my two grandchildren, Tillman and Cile Surratt. I love these two kids greatly. They won't see Medicare, and they're going to see an America that's quite different from the one that we see today if we don't make some major changes, major changes in Medicare and Social Security. If we don't shrink them and make them economically viable for my grandchildren, that are 6 and 7, my grandchildren won't see Medicare. They won't see Social Security. And, in fact, people who are 45 or 50 today won't see Social Security or Medicare if we don't strengthen them,

if we don't do the necessary hard work of bringing about those changes to strengthening Medicare and Social Security to make them economically viable.

I hear our Democrat colleagues all the time talk about it's the children. I've heard our former Speaker talk about it's about the children so much that I wanted to throw up.

But the thing is, when you talk about it's the children and their future, we've got to deal with this debt. We've got to deal with Social Security and Medicare and make them economically viable by strengthening them, by making them so that they're still available when my kids get grown.

And we're going down a road right now—this President and the Democrats in the Senate and the Democrats here in the House have a three-word plan. Their plan is a three-word plan for Social Security and Medicare: deny the problem. They're denying it. They're delaying doing anything about it. And they're going to destroy it, because both Medicare and Social Security are going broke if we don't strengthen it, if we don't make it economically viable, if we don't do the necessary hard work that this Congress and Republicans are trying to do.

But what do we hear from our colleagues on the other side? Demagoguery and trying to play politics. It's time to stop the politics. It's time to stop playing games.

The American people deserve the truth. No more accounting gimmicks. No more playing with numbers. No more double talk, political speak.

This is the Democrats' plan—deny it, delay it, destroy it—for Medicare, Social Security and this country economically. We've got to change it, and that's what Republicans are working very hard to do.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. And while we're on the "D" word, if you will, deny, delay, demagogue, I'll use another, D word, and it's really the softest thing I can say about the Democrats' plan, and that is disingenuous.

For them to stand up, or for the President to stand up and say that he's going to fix Medicare, at the same time, Dr. ROE talked about this earlier in the evening, I'm going to refer back to him in just a few minutes, but at the same time, in the creation of a whole new entitlement program in March of last year, we know it as ObamaCare. Officially, I guess I should say, it's called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I think it's the unaffordable care act in that it cost \$1 trillion.

But where did the money come from to pay for this new entitlement program that really has nothing to do with seniors?

Well, my colleagues, look at this poster to my left, your right. Here's where at least half of the money came from. Cutting Medicare, cutting Medicare by \$575 billion. I mean, right out

of the Medicare program. That included home health care; it included Hospice. But the biggest cut was \$130 billion, that's bullet point No. 2, \$130 billion from the Medicare Advantage plans. And my colleagues know this, and I'm sure they'll want to comment on it, of the 47 million people, 45, 47 million people today who are on Medicare, about seven to 10 million of them receive their medical care on the Medicare Advantage option, which gives them more benefits, more bang for the buck; and it covers a lot of preventive services that are not given, not offered in traditional Medicare as we know it.

So that cut, \$130 billion, that's something like a 14 percent cut out of that program. That means that at least half of these seniors are going to have to go back into Medicare as we know it and get a lesser benefit.

In fact, it's been said by the actuary of Medicare, Richard Foster, on April 22, 2010, that 15 percent of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care providers will close because Medicare pays less under ObamaCare.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I want to yield just briefly again to the gentleman from Georgia before I yield some additional time to my colleague, our cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank you for yielding just a moment to me because I want to add to that statistic; 15 percent of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care will close because Medicare pays less under ObamaCare. That's absolutely true. A lot of those hospitals are going to be in rural communities because rural communities are going to be hit the hardest.

Right now I'm a primary care doctor. As the gentleman knows, I'm a family doctor. I've done general medicine for almost 40 years now.

The American Academy of Family Physicians said right now, today, one in eight family docs will not accept Medicare at all. Only one in three doctors, according to the American Medical Association limits how many Medicare patients that they take.

□ 2100

That is a marked rise. Back in 2004, only 6 percent of all doctors limited their Medicare patients. In 2008, it went up to 8 percent. Now it's almost one-third limit the amount of Medicare patients that they see. And one in eight family docs don't take Medicare at all; they can't afford to because of the low reimbursement rates. And IPAB is going to hit those folks that much harder.

During our Special Order when we were discussing ObamaCare I made a comment that somebody may have a free health care card in their pocket, but it's going to be as worthless as a Confederate dollar after the War Be-

tween the States because nobody will take it, and that's exactly where we are headed. So I just wanted to add that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I now yield to my cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. TIM MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY.

I want to talk for about 5 minutes here on an issue that you brought up, Dr. GINGREY, about the \$575 billion from the Medicare program that also cuts \$135 billion from Medicare Advantage plans, forcing over 7 million seniors out of their current Medicare plan unless they pay more.

I wanted to help point out that while the President and others are out there saying we're trying to cut Medicare and what it does, nothing could be further from the truth. What we're trying to do here is show how if Medicare is handled differently—not by IPAB or a board of bureaucrats, but by letting the plans work and letting doctors work, they can drive down cost by improving quality.

Let me explain what happened in the Medicare Advantage program that was gutted in the health care bill that was passed out of the House. Well, seniors are able to make choices right now—with Medicare, they can get Medicare part D drug coverage and supplemental Medigap policies with the Medicare Advantage plan. What the Medicare Advantage plan does is allows some management of diseases that are chronic illnesses, which is very different from the current fee-for-service where somebody would get paid based upon the number of procedures they do. Under the regular Medicare fee-for-service plan, hospital readmission rates—that's 30 days post-discharge for the country—in 2007 was over 18 percent, but the average readmission rate across Medicare Advantage was 13.5 percent. Why? Because it allowed physicians and nurses to talk to the patient, to follow the patient, to work with the disease, to make sure whatever complication they had—an infection or heart disease or lung disease or an orthopedic problem—to pay that physician and staff to work for them.

Here is another interesting thing: The Medicare fee-for-service rate of preventable emergency department visits was 15.5 visits per 100 beneficiary months in 2007. But the average rate across Medicare Advantage plans and study was two visits per 100 beneficiary months—86 percent lower than Medicare's national average.

Here's another point: Actual cost for the drug plan we know, Medicare part D, comes out 40 percent under budget because insurers are forced to compete with each other. Now imagine this: Seniors can choose Medicare supplemental plans, and those plans compete for seniors' coverage. The drug plans compete for seniors' coverage. What

happens if seniors are allowed to also choose their main Medicare plan? Well, listen to this additional issue about drugs: The Intercontinental Marketing Services, IMS—I should say this comes from the Deloitte & Touche Web site—the Institute for Healthcare Informatics study concluded: The average cost for drugs frequently used by Medicare prescription drug part D beneficiaries declined since the implementation of the program in 2006. Between January, 2006, and December, 2010, for the top ten therapeutic classes, part D drugs decreased by over one-third, from \$1.50 to \$1. The study projected that costs will continue to decline by 57 percent from 2006 to 2015, reaching 65 cents by the end of 2015. That's a massive decline. Why? Because plans are competing against each other. Plans innovate, they try and do things better and smarter, with better quality, and they ask seniors to choose their plan. Seniors then, by signing their name, can choose a plan that works for them.

Why not allow seniors to have Medicare choice with their major Medicare plan? Why not allow seniors to have Medicare Advantage instead of gutting the program? This is the very thing we're saying; by improving efficiencies and qualities within the program, a lot of cost can be reduced. It can't be reduced, however, by the status quo. As you pointed out, Dr. GINGREY, and my colleagues, keeping the status quo means there won't be Medicare. There will be Medicare for those currently on it. It won't be there for their children and certainly not for their grandchildren. We want to save Medicare, but you can't save it by the continued way it's being done now.

Quite frankly, the system that's being done out there now to frighten seniors, to say that if we don't simply pass this debt limit increase without strings attached, that seniors won't have Social Security or Medicare, this is such a falsehood. And it's a serious problem in two ways: One, it's serious because it's telling a falsehood to seniors; and two, it looks down upon seniors thinking that they're susceptible, not smart enough to figure out that this is false.

It is so important, and we want the American public to understand: We are trying to save Medicare because we do want it to be there for the future, but it means making it more efficient. And what's wrong with letting doctors be the ones who call the shots on improving care?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has spent his professional life providing medical services to his patients, just as so many of the doctors in the caucus.

Talking about this cut to Medicare Advantage, as Dr. MURPHY described that method of getting care, Mr. Speaker, it is exactly what we continue to talk about today of wanting to reward health care based on quality and

not necessarily quantity. Just strictly fee-for-service—the number of times you go to see a provider and that provider getting paid, albeit a small amount—is not a very efficient way. And certainly a much more efficient way—and we continue to talk about this—is to provide quality of care. And Dr. MURPHY correctly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what Medicare Advantage does; it offers a quality of care and a wellness provision. Were we paying these plans a little too much for those services? I don't know, maybe, possibly. But if you're going to cut any amount, certainly 14 percent, \$130 billion, is too much because that guts those plans.

But whatever savings you get out of Medicare, shouldn't they stay in the Medicare program, if you believe the Medicare actuary and the trustees that say that if we don't do something by 2024, the trust fund, the hospital trust fund is depleted, there is no more Medicare as we know it or any other way. So if you're going to find savings in the Medicare program, you don't take that money, \$575 billion, and use it to create a whole new entitlement program so that everybody in the whole country has health insurance whether they need it or not, whether they want it or not. I can think of a lot of things in the Medicare program where this money could be well spent. How about long-term care, extended care facility coverage to keep that money in Medicare? Instead, what ObamaCare comes up with is something called the CLASS Act—which is a classless act, Mr. Speaker, because it is a misleading program that can't fund itself, that absolutely can't fund itself.

So there are so many things about ObamaCare and Obama's plan to save Medicare—which really, as Dr. BROWN pointed out, is no plan at all, other than what Dr. ROE has pointed out in regard to this Independent Payment Advisory Board that is going to cut spending for the most vulnerable seniors, those that are the sickest, those that incur the highest cost. And they say there is no rationing, but it will indeed, as my colleagues have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, be denial of care.

At this point, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee to talk a little bit more about that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out one thing that Dr. GINGREY just pointed out, which was one of the reasons that the American people don't trust politicians. The CLASS Act may be a good idea. The CLASS Act began this year where you have some money taken out of your paycheck and put in a savings account over here. It's supposed to be about \$87 billion in 5 years, and we can't get it out until that 5-year period of time occurs and this money has accumulated. At that time it's supposed to pay for long-term care, about \$50 per day. But guess what happens, Mr. Speaker? What happens is

that we borrow the money out and spend it on current health care and call this an asset.

□ 2110

We have counted that money twice; two times. We have done that with Social Security already. I find this absolutely offensive, on August 2, 10 days, about a week from now, we have had the audacity to tell people who have paid into Social Security for 40 or 50 years they will not be able to get their check. Why? Because the Federal Government has spent that money. We are doing the same thing again with the CLASS Act. There has already been legislation to perhaps overturn that.

I want to get back to something a little more basic, and that is to the examining room with the patient. The people who should be making health care decisions should be a family, the patient and their physician, sitting around and talking about what their options are, not some 15 people appointed bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

By the way, Dr. GINGREY and Mr. Speaker, we have over 190 cosponsors, including a bipartisan cosponsorship to the repeal of IPAB, including every physician, every health care provider on the Republican side and Dr. CHRISTENSEN, who was down here just a moment ago on the Democratic side. It is a bipartisan agreement that we should overturn this. The American Medical Association believes it should be overturned. Over 270 major medical organizations see through this as a very bad thing for patients.

The reason we are worried about it, we have heard Dr. BROWN speak about it, and we have heard you speak about it, Mr. Speaker. Ultimately it will affect the quality of care. Why? Because if you don't have access to your doctor, the quality of your care will go down.

The other thing I want to mention is we talk about changing Medicare. Quite frankly, I'm going to go through just a few of the things that already have been changed in this Affordable Care Act. Beginning in 2010, there were Medicare cuts to hospitals, long-term care and inpatient rehabilitation services.

In 2011, it has been pointed out that the Medicare Advantage plans, the seniors did get a \$250 check to fill the doughnut hole. The wealthier seniors began paying higher premiums for Medicare part D; that's in 2011. Medicare imaging cuts, Medicare reimbursement cuts: when seniors get a CT scan or an MRI, Medicare cuts for durable medical equipment began, ambulance services, ambulatory service centers, diagnostic labs, durable medical equipment, wheelchairs. Seniors prohibited from purchasing power wheelchairs unless they rent for 13 months.

In 2012, elimination of the deduction for the employer expenses for Medicare drug subsidies, that is how they raised \$4.5 billion. And that is not to improve our current underfunded Medicare

plan. That is to create another entitlement. Medical expense deduction, you raise the threshold for deducting medical expenses from 7½ to 10 percent. That raises \$15 billion to be spent elsewhere. That is a tax right there.

Hospice care is being cut. Dialysis, Medicare cuts to dialysis treatment will be cut in 2012.

In 2014, this Independent Payment Advisory Board begins. And, by the way, they are getting, I believe it's \$12 million a year to fund this right now. If there is any way we can cut off funding to that board right now, it should be done.

In 2015, a permanent cut to the payment rate to home health agencies. On and on. We have felt these cuts because they haven't come to fruition yet. What we are trying to do with Medicare is to salvage the program for future generations.

A promise made is a promise kept. If you are 55 years and older, with Social Security and Medicare, nothing happens. I hear all the time about a voucher. This is a voucher system and so forth. Here is what a voucher is. A voucher is when I go to my mailbox, something comes that says this has so much value. You take this piece of paper and purchase something with it. Premium support is where the Federal Government, through its massive ability to go out and negotiate prices, exactly like they do for you and me, Mr. Speaker, in our health care plan here in Congress, they negotiate with numerous companies through the Federal exchange. Our plan is called the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, and they negotiate the best price. And what happens is all during the campaign, the last 2 years I have heard seniors and others say, Congressman, I want exactly what you have. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

A higher income senior like myself, and you and the others in this room, will pay a higher premium. And folks with preexisting conditions and lower income will pay much lower. And they will have those choices. As Dr. MURPHY pointed out, why do we think that will save money and why are we doing it. It has been pointed out that it is a catastrophe waiting to happen if we do not do something.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE. What he was describing, if I can elaborate a little more on that point to our colleagues because I think some still are confused, possibly on both sides of the aisle, but clearly this plan that is put forth in the House budget, and it's the Republican budget because we are in the majority. It is sometimes referred to as the Paul Ryan budget because he is chairman of the Budget Committee. It is sometimes referred to as the Path to Prosperity.

But in that budget which we sent to the Senate; and, unfortunately, the Senate majority leader has deep-sixed it, if you will, but in that budget plan that Dr. ROE was referring to, it has

taken the responsible approach based on the trustees' estimate of the Medicare program going totally broke by the year 2024, and that information is bipartisan. That's the Medicare board of trustees.

To ignore that, as my colleague from Georgia said in his remarks, the "D" words, to defund, to deny, what were some of the others, Dr. BROWN? To deny, delay, destroy, demagogue, and I added to those "D" words their plan is rather disingenuous, but what Dr. ROE was describing is to protect and preserve Medicare as we know.

Whether it is traditional Medicare, maybe we can salvage Medicare Advantage, and hold harmless anybody that is over age 55, 55 through 65. They were 10 years away from being eligible for a Medicare benefit. So they will be in those plans as we know it. But this approach that Dr. ROE so adequately describes, Mr. Speaker, this premium support program, not a voucher, as he pointed out, the premium support program, which by the way would be administered by the Office of Personnel Management, the same folks that talk to us and find out what kind of health care benefit we want, those Members who are under 65, that you pick and choose and you negotiate. They will do the same thing for future, those under age 55 today, future Medicare beneficiaries. They will get the best bang for the buck, the best care for their individual needs.

Now, it is estimated that in 2022 that premium support amount on average will be \$8,000 a year. Now, our Democratic friends, Mr. Speaker, want to say, Well, that's not enough. That's not enough. Seniors are going to have to reach in their pocket.

But what they don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that premium will be higher for anybody who comes into the Medicare program who is already sick, who already has several things wrong with them; and that certainly is possible.

When I got Medicare eligible, I had already had open heart surgery. So these people will have a higher premium than the average of \$8,000 a year. And as they age, even if their health is perfect the day they come into Medicare, they become Medicare eligible—they may have the Methuselah gene and have wonderful health. They may jog 3 miles a day, don't smoke, don't drink excessively, don't skydive—but as they get older, that premium support will automatically go up because we know statistically that as you get older the chances of something happening are greater.

And last but not least, the higher your income, the lower your premium support.

□ 2120

So our seniors, who need it the most, will get a higher—they won't get the average \$8,000. They will get a higher premium support. I think it is a wonderful plan, Mr. Speaker. I absolutely

do. It shows the responsibility of the majority party in this House of Representatives.

Of course, as my colleagues have pointed out, what is the plan from the Democrats, the Democrat majority in the Senate and from this President: deny it, delay it, destroy it, demagogue it. Or, as my colleague from Tennessee has pointed out, kill it by creating this Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB, which will, without question, lead to denial of care and rationing.

I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I want to emphasize is having no plan is a prescription for disaster for our country. We have a solemn obligation to provide health care for our seniors. We have made that promise. And how do we do it? Again, back to what I said, I do not want a board that is appointed by a Democrat or Republican or any bureaucrat. What I want is I want health care decisions made by physicians, the patient, and their family. The way that is going to happen is through this plan where we use premium support to allow people choice and to have them make those choices, not insurance companies and certainly not the Federal Government.

From what I have seen up here in my two terms is I don't want a bunch of Federal bureaucrats in charge of my bypass operation or my gallbladder operation—or my bunion operation, for that matter. I want my doctor in charge of it. That is who I want making those decisions, along with my family.

I think this is one of the biggest discussions we will have in this Congress is how we do this right. Not only does it affect the budget. Forget the budget. Forget all that right now. We are talking about people's lives. We are talking about the care that they get. And right now, as I mentioned, these changes are already made. This is already in the current law that I talked about just a minute ago.

When you talk about Medicare as it is, folks, it's been changed, big time. When this board kicks in—and there's a very good article if you are sort of a wonk like I am and want to go back to the New England Journal of Medicine, one of our major journals, in, I believe it was, May of 2010. Their estimate was—this is one of our major scientific journals—that this IPAB board would have kicked in 21 of the last 25 years if it had been in place. So it's not some idle threat that this will happen. If you look retrospectively at what's happened, it would have happened 21 out of 25 times.

What would that mean? That would mean, as Dr. BROWN, Mr. Speaker, pointed out just a moment ago, as these payments for physicians go down and down and down below their cost of providing the care, they no longer can see you. You lose access to your doctors, like Dr. BROWN.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. What Dr. ROE is talking about, Mr. Speaker, is on top of these cuts that our medical providers are currently facing under this so-called flawed formula sustainable growth rate, which I'm sure I'm correct on this, in the past 9 years every calculation has been a cut to provider reimbursement to the point now that while we in Congress have had the ability to mitigate that, that if these cuts finally in the aggregate come due December 31 of this year, it is a 30 percent cut. So we haven't solved that problem yet for our providers but yet we are adding on top of that this IPAB board that can make additional cuts to provider reimbursement without any ability of the Congress, we the Members of Congress, to stop that injustice.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. A good point.

Peter Orszag, who was the previous OMB Director here, said this is one of the biggest losses of power the Congress has given up since the Federal Reserve. That's been almost a hundred years ago. What we're doing is the Congress takes two-thirds to overturn what they recommend in this IPAB. We could do it if we get a two-thirds vote. And it is not appealable. You don't have any appeal to a court system to do anything about this.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, still, we can overrule with a two-thirds vote. But we still have to find cuts in the Medicare program somewhere else for the same dollar amount.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

What would happen is we could make those cuts, but they have to be made somewhere else. The cuts have to be made. Nowhere should Congress give up its ability to do that. We are, our House, the House side, we're the representatives of the people. We are the closest to them. We have 700,000 constituents that we go talk to every time we get home. And we ought to be beholden to those folks in our districts across this country and not to some board up here in Congress that is not accountable to anybody.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Georgia is kind enough to have stayed with us throughout the hour, and I would like to yield additional time to him, if he would like.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. I would certainly like the time.

The American people need to understand that the purpose of ObamaCare, the bottom line really was expressed by the President himself when he said he wanted everybody in this country in one pool. What's that mean for everybody? It means socialized medicine. That's what all IPAB and all these cuts and everything is geared to do is to force doctors out of private practice, make them employees of the Federal Government, make patients subject to some bureaucrat here in Washington

and tell them what kind of health care they can get.

And the Democrats' plan is to deny, to delay, and to destroy Medicare by letting it go broke. But I want to just add, Dr. GINGREY, to your other "d," the demagoguery that we see. I want to give three examples because the facts have really been, by and large, hidden from the American people.

AARP did an ad, a new one, talking about all the places where the Feds could cut spending, like treadmills for shrimp—well, I certainly want to cut that out—but instead, Republicans insist on cutting seniors' Medicare. Well, that's not true. AARP and the Democrats want to cut Medicare by destroying it, letting it go broke.

An ad put out by the Gender Project, a liberal nonprofit group, shows an elderly woman being heaved off the side of a cliff, with her being in a wheelchair, and asks: Is America beautiful without Medicare? Ask PAUL RYAN and his friends in Congress.

That is nothing but bald-faced lies, because we are trying to make sure that seniors get, as Dr. ROE said, a promise made, a promise kept. We want to shore up Medicare and Social Security. We want to strengthen Medicare, not destroy it, like the Democrats are going to do.

Let me give you a third example, then I will yield back.

On the Republican budget, President Obama said in his speech at George Washington University just last month: "Instead of guaranteed health care, you will get a voucher. If that voucher isn't worth enough to buy the insurance that is available in the open marketplace, well, tough luck. You're on your own. Put simply, it ends Medicare as we know it." President Obama.

It's demagoguery. It's lies, bald-faced lies designed to try to scare the American people, particularly senior citizens. We are trying to shore up Medicare. We are trying to strengthen Medicare. We are trying to save Medicare from going broke. But the Reid-Pelosi-Obama ObamaCare is to deny it, to delay it, to destroy it, and to demagogue it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. As I said earlier, the kindest thing I can say is it is disingenuous.

Stop the Democrats' plan to end Medicare. If left alone, the Democrats' Medicare cut plan created in ObamaCare threatens Medicare seniors today as well as those who will come into the program tomorrow.

So, colleagues, how do we stop the Democrats' Medicare cut plan first and foremost? We need to repeal ObamaCare. But we need to vote and support Dr. ROE's bill to repeal this IPAB board and tell President Obama and Democrats that Medicare reform should not rely on restricting benefits and access for sick and disabled seniors in need.

As we conclude tonight, let me just say, colleagues, oppose the Democrats' Medicare cut board. Visit the GOP Doc-

tors Caucus Web site and sign the online petition. Oppose the Democrats' plan to destroy Medicare.

And here are the Web sites: doctorscaucus.gingrey.house.gov or doctorscaucus.murphy.house.gov, the two cochair's of the House Doctors Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our leadership for giving us an opportunity to bring to the American public and to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle the true facts of this case—that we have a plan; the President has no plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BERG (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of his good friend, former North Dakota State Senate Majority Leader Bob Stenehjem.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 22 on account of attending a funeral in the district.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 5 p.m.

Ms. RICHARDSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 300. An act to prevent abuse of Government charge cards; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; in addition to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2595. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Extra Long Staple Cotton Crop Provisions [Docket No.: FCIC-10-0002] (RIN: 0563-AC27) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2596. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, De-

partment of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Successor Entities to the Netherlands Antilles (DFARS Case 2011-D029) (RIN: 0750-AH32) received July 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2597. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1195] received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2598. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1199] received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2599. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Temporary Exemptions for Eligible Credit Default Swaps to Facilitate Operation of Central Counterparties to Clear and Settle Credit Default Swaps [Release Nos. 33-9232; 34-64800; 39-2476; File No. S7-02-09] (RIN: 3235-AK26) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2600. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) — Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTCs) — Interventions to Promote Community Living Among Individuals with Disabilities [CDEA Number: 84.133B-1] received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2601. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Validated End-User Authorization for CSMC Technologies Corporation in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 1101519290-1298-01] (RIN: 0694-AF25) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List: Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security for Foreign Policy Interests of the United States [Docket No.: 110128065-1135-01] (RIN: 0694-AF12) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2603. A letter from the Associate Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Libyan Sanctions Regulations, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2604. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves and Repatriation Act Regulations — Definition of "Indian tribe" (RIN: 1024-AD98) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2587. A bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance; with an amendment (Rep. 112-179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2445. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide States and local educational agencies with maximum flexibility in using Federal funds provided under such Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 370. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-181). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2631. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to prohibit the use of certain anti-competitive forward contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DENT, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for life sciences research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2633. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the time limits for appeals in civil cases to which United States officers or employees are parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2634. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to provide assistance for certain individuals affected by exposure to Agent Orange and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enhance the availability of medical care for descendants of veterans of the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to suspend the Presidential \$1 Coin Program when coin stockpiles are sufficient to meet the needs for one year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2636. A bill to authorize depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac to lease foreclosed property held by such enti-

ties for up to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mr. LOEBBSACK):

H.R. 2637. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2638. A bill to authorize the adjustment of status for immediate family members of individuals who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ACK-

ERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2639. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. OLIVER):

H.R. 2640. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

462 Washington Street in Woburn, Massachusetts, as the "Officer John Maguire Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2641. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey real property, including improvements, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in Ketchikan, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 368. A resolution requesting return of official papers on H.R. 1309; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 369. A resolution to state the belief of the House of Representatives that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have the authority to choose the order in which to pay obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 371. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Hear My Cry Day" in schools across the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 9 and clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States of America, the authority to enact this legislation rests with the Congress.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 24: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISSA, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 49: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 87: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 114: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 136: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 176: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 210: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 303: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 361: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 371: Mr. HURT, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, and Mrs. ADAMS.

H.R. 376: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 402: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 420: Mr. PENCE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 431: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 440: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 451: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 452: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. REED, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 459: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 546: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 574: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 583: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BARROW, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 645: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 664: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 680: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 687: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 688: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 711: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 719: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 721: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 735: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 743: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 835: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 886: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 959: Mr. HULTGREN and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1041: Mr. BOREN and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1058: Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 1154: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1195: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1206: Mr. MARINO and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1219: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1283: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. WEST.

H.R. 1291: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1311: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1342: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1348: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1351: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1358: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1394: Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1397: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1461: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. MORAN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1465: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1466: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1479: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1489: Mr. FILNER and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1505: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1558: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1588: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1681: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1697: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1754: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1815: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1817: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1845: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1852: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RUNYAN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1855: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1865: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1897: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1959: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1981: Mr. STARK and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1995: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2005: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 2016: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2025: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 2028: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2032: Mr. HERGER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2069: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2086: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2092: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 2107: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2140: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 2146: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2164: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2189: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2210: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr.

DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2217: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 2247: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2250: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2304: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 2310: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2324: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2337: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS of California, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2362: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2397: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2402: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 2407: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2414: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2429: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 2433: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2443: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2449: Ms. MOORE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2453: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2457: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2469: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2492: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEST, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2497: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2524: Mr. HONDA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2530: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2534: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2541: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2543: Mr. FILNER and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2544: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2559: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2581: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 2587: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2594: Mr. FILNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2597: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 2600: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2605: Mr. HECK and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 8: Ms. NORTON.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HALL.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. NEAL.

H.J. Res. 73: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 4: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 60: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 134: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Res. 207: Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 295: Ms. DELAULO.

H. Res. 304: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H. Res. 361: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Res. 364: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WEST, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr.

STARK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT No. 4: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION FOR NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA PERFORMING ARTS PROGRAM

SEC. _____. None of the amounts made available in the Act may be used for the National Capital Area Performing Arts Program.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 14, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,206,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,206,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. SULLIVAN

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to implement—

(1) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on November 4, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 68093 et seq.); or

(2) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 4662 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$70,000,000)”.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$85,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,804,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 10, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$120,000)”.

Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 39, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$47,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$900,000,000)”.

Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$771,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$78,000,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 88, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$432,000,000)”.

Page 96, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 103, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$135,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$125,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 105, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,231,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FLORES

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT No. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to, pursuant to section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545), register, or consider registration of, a fuel that contains greater than 10 volume percent ethanol.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to register, or consider registration of, a fuel pursuant to—

(1) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on November 4, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 68094 et seq.); or

(2) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent” published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 4662 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$11,000,000) (increased by \$11,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 12: Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$2,510,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$2,510,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$13,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 101, line 10, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$55,624,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$55,624,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BERG

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate, implement, administer, or enforce a Federal implementation plan under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) that imposes any standard or requirement to address regional haze pursuant to subpart P of part 51 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to protection of visibility).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LATHAM

AMENDMENT No. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize or implement any rule-making under section 308 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1318) pertaining to a settlement agreement related to the case captioned “National Pork Producers Council v. EPA, No. 08-61093” or “NRDC v. EPA, No. 09-60510”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 15, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$18,294,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$_____)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 18: Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,860,800)”.

Page 158, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$20,860,800)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or otherwise carry out, paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 20: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO BORDER PATROL ACTIVITIES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enforce any regulation that would impede or obstruct the United States Border Patrol from patrol activities on Federal lands.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 31, line 3, strike “not”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$4,880,000)”.

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$15,047,000)”.

Page 15, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$18,294,000)”.

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$50,721,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 23: Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FARENTHOLD

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION IN PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used issue a preliminary rule or a final rule, or to take any other action to reduce the legal speed limit in Padre Island National Seashore.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. FARENTHOLD

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used on any activity interfering with States’ efforts to regulate the energy recovery technology known as hydraulic fracturing by making recommendations that apply national solutions to unique State or regional issues, including well construction and disclosure.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 26: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO REGULATION OF OFFSHORE SERVICE CONTRACTORS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to regulate non-lease holders under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 331 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for grants to foreign governments or organizations.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to prohibit the use of sulfur dioxide for agricultural purposes, including for the control of insect pests in harvested and processed foods and in food handling and processing facilities.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for grants for programs, projects, or activities outside the United States.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct aerial surveys of any facility in the State of Florida in Polk county or Hillsborough county that is listed in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 103, line 14, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$1,660,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$1,660,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 32: Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,507,550)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,507,550)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for climate change research, activities, or programs.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. TERRY

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay attorneys fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. 504; 28 U.S.C. 2412) that arise out of any administrative proceeding or civil action in which the party commencing the proceeding or action would suffer no economic loss as a result of not prevailing in the proceeding or action.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide grants to the People’s Republic of China.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO THE HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Heritage Partnership Program.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 38: Page 127, line 25, strike “from manure management systems”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 39: Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,246,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,246,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT No. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the requirements of section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) against a refiner (as defined in section 80.1142(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations) for operations conducted in 2012 fiscal year.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 41: Page 76, lines 10 and 13, insert after each dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 42: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO ESTABLISHING A MANATEE REFUGE IN FLORIDA

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or finalize the proposed rule published in the Federal Register on June 22, 2011, at 76 Fed. Reg. 36493 (related to Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Rule To Establish a Manatee Refuge in Kings Bay, Citrus County, Florida).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT No. 43: Page 108, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. REED

AMENDMENT No. 44: Page 32, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$8,291,000)”.

Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$8,291,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 45: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any oil or gas preleasing, leasing, or related activities for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf located within 25 miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 46: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any new oil or gas preleasing, leasing, drilling, or related activities using facilities that are visible from shore for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf located within 25 miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 47: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 48: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,500,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,500,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$3,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470) or the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS
AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of sections 405(b) or 410(b) of Public Law 101-593.